

THE  
CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW.

N<sup>O</sup>. CLXIV. JULY 1916.

---

ART. I.—CHURCH AND STATE IN INDIA

1. *The Church in Madras.* By the Rev. F. PENNY. Two volumes. (London : Smith, Elder and Co. 1904, 1912.)
2. *Proceedings of the Episcopal Synod of the Province of India and Ceylon* A.D. 1910 and A.D. 1912.
3. *A Conscience Clause for Indians in Indian Education Codes.* By the Hon'ble Mr. V. S. SRINIVASA SASTRI, Servants of India Society. (Poona, India : Published by Anant Vinayak Patavardhan at the Aryabhushan Press, 1916.)

I

THE position of the Church of England in India is more complex and anomalous than that of any other Church in Christendom. The status of the Bishops is a good illustration of this. There are altogether thirteen Bishops in the Province. Of these three are appointed by the Crown under Letters Patent and are entirely paid by the Government of India ; four others are appointed by the Crown under Letters Patent and are paid partly by the Government and partly by endowments ; the Bishop of Travancore and Cochin is appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury under what is known as the Jerusalem Act and is entirely paid by the Church Missionary Society. The Bishop of Chota Nagpur is appointed by the Metropolitan and entirely paid by the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel.

The Bishop in Tinnevelly and Madura is appointed by the Bishop of Madras with the approval of the Metropolitan and is paid partly by endowments and partly by grants from the two Societies, the S.P.G. and C.M.S. The Bishop of Dornakal is appointed by the Bishop of Madras with the approval of the Metropolitan and is entirely paid by endowments. The Bishop of Colombo is appointed by the Diocesan Synod and is paid by endowments.

The relationship of the Bishops to the various missionary organizations in their dioceses is almost equally varied. Where only one Society is working the Bishop is the head of the whole missionary organization of the Diocese. Where both the S.P.G. and C.M.S. are working in the same Diocese the Bishop is the head of the S.P.G. organization and in some cases is the nominal head of the C.M.S. Councils. The relation of the Bishop of Madras to the various missionary organizations of South India is a good example of the strange anomalies of the position. He is the President of the Madras Diocesan Committee of the S.P.G. which controls the work of the Society in the Diocese of Madras. He is a member of the Corresponding Committee of the C.M.S. and whenever he is present presides at their meetings. This Committee controls the work of the Society in the Dioceses of Tinnevelly and Madura, of Travancore and Cochin and of Dornakal as well as in the Diocese of Madras. Until a few years ago a Maharatta mission in the Aurangabad district of the Nizam's Dominions, which was under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Madras, was controlled by the C.M.S. Corresponding Committee at Bombay of which the Bishop of Bombay was Chairman.

The legal position is equally anomalous. The Church of England in India is supposed to be under the ecclesiastical laws of England, yet they are not the laws which are in force to-day, but the laws which were in force a hundred years ago, and nobody knows exactly what they are or how they are to be administered. The Letters Patent provide for an appeal to Commissioners Delegate to be chosen from a body that has since passed away. The discipline of the clergy is to be exercised, according to the Letters Patent,



under laws which are now obsolete and by means of officials who do not exist.

To some Churchmen this seems a very shocking state of things. It is not to be wondered at that to the legal mind the whole position of the Church of England in India should appear utterly chaotic and impossible. The strange thing is, however, that no one seems a bit the worse for all this complexity and anomaly, and that to some people it even appears as if the present state of the Church in India were a beautiful illustration of the adaptation of organism to environment. The Church of England has grown up in India for the past 250 years in close connexion with the British Empire and has gradually adapted herself to the changing conditions of her own life and the life of the Empire. Many things, therefore, in the constitution of the Church, which from a purely legal or academic point of view appear to be intolerable, may fairly be regarded as the best available methods of dealing with a wholly exceptional set of circumstances. A very brief sketch of the past history of the Church may serve at any rate to explain the anomalies of the position, if not to justify them.

The establishment of the Church of England in India may be traced to the conviction of the Directors of the East India Company that it was their duty to supply religious ministrations to their own servants. The Directors were primarily traders and merchants; but they were as a whole a body of good Christian men and their records shew real concern about the moral and spiritual state of their employees. As soon as they began to trade with India, therefore, they took steps to supply religious ministrations to the sailors on board their ships. They began in a modest way in the first half of the Seventeenth century by ordering 'that prayers be said every morning and evening in every ship, and the whole Company called thereunto with diligent eyes, that none be wanting: so as all may jointly with reverence and humility pray unto Almighty God, to bless and preserve them from all dangers in this long and tedious voyage: for the better performance whereof we have delivered to each of the pursers a Bible, wherein is contained

the Book of Common Prayer.' In 1607 they began to appoint Chaplains for their ships at salaries varying from £50 to £100 a year according to their qualifications. From these humble beginnings the Church of England in India has gradually grown up in the course of the last 250 years.

Towards the middle of the Seventeenth century the Company began to acquire land and establish factories in India and to send out Chaplains to reside at their factories. The first resident Chaplain was sent to Surat in 1644 and afterwards to Fort Saint George, Madras, in 1647, and from that time onwards Chaplains were regularly appointed to the chief factories of the Company in India, at Madras, Cuddalore, Masulipatam, Surat and Calcutta. The main object of their appointment was to minister to the Company's servants, but in those early days the principle of religious neutrality had not yet been thought of and the Company were anxious that their Chaplains should interest themselves in missionary work. In the Charter of 1698 there was a clause that 'the Chaplains in the factories are to study the vernacular language, the better to enable them to instruct the Gentoos that shall be the servants or slaves of the same Company, or of their agents, in the Protestant religion.' And in 1614 a young Indian, who had been taught to read and write by the Chaplain of Masulipatam, was sent home in one of the Company's ships to be instructed in the Christian religion with a view to his being sent back to India to convert some of his nation. After being duly instructed in England he was baptized at the Church of St. Dionis Backchurch, Fenchurch Street, in the presence of some of the members of the Privy Council, the Lord Mayor and Aldermen, the members of the East India Company and of the sister Company of Virginia. The Church, we are told, was packed with a large congregation, and the young man's Christian name, Peter, was chosen by the King<sup>1</sup>. The Company were also staunch upholders of the Protestant religion, which meant in those days the religion of the Church of England, and had no intention of adopting an attitude of neutrality towards

<sup>1</sup> Penny, *Church in Madras*, vol. i pp. 14-15.



the Roman Catholic Church. In one of their letters to their Agent at Fort Saint George, Madras, they state that

‘they had received informations of many evil practices exercised in the town of Madras by the French Padres which are not to be tolerated where the Protestant religion is professed, their marching to the Burial place before the dead corpse with bell, book, candle and cross, their visiting such persons in their sickness who have professed the Protestant religion and endeavouring to seduce them to their idolatrous customs of praying to Saints etc., as also to baptise the children of Englishmen immediately on their coming into the world.’

They strictly enjoin their Agent not to allow any of these attacks on the Protestant faith.

Their hostility towards the Roman Church was largely due to political motives. Mr. Penny quotes a despatch from the Directors dated A.D. 1708 in which they state :

‘We are apprehensive that notwithstanding you keep the Priests at Madras under a pretty decorum, yet there is no reliance upon the Papist inhabitants in time of danger, and that we can never reckon upon the true strength of the place being at our disposal, unless the natives are educated in the Protestant religion.’<sup>1</sup>

During the Eighteenth century the Company gradually acquired vast territories in India : the number of their servants, civil and military, largely increased, and in consequence the establishment of Chaplains in the service of the Company was considerably enlarged. Many churches were built and schools established during this century. Mr. Penny has successfully vindicated the reputation of the Company in this respect from much misrepresentation.

‘It is generally supposed,’ he says, ‘that the Company was absolutely hostile to missionary work in its dependencies. As a matter of fact the Company was most liberal to the S.P.C.K. in the grant of free passages for its missionaries all through the 18th century, as well as for goods of all kinds connected with their work. And according to the testimony of the Missionaries themselves, many servants of the Company in the Presidency

<sup>1</sup> *The Church in Madras*, vol. i p. 133.

of Madras were most kind in their reception and treatment of them, most liberal and sympathetic in furthering their designs.' <sup>1</sup>

During all this period the Chaplains of the Company were under the jurisdiction of the Bishop of London.

Up to the end of the Eighteenth century, then, the East India Company had no official connexion whatever with the missionaries and the Indian congregations to which they ministered. But a change took place in the early years of the Nineteenth century. In 1793, when the question of the renewal of the Charter was discussed in the House of Commons, William Wilberforce and his friends attempted to commit the Company to a definitely missionary policy. They persuaded the House of Commons to resolve in Committee not only that sufficient means of religious worship and instruction be provided for all persons of the Protestant Communion in the service or under the protection of the East India Company in Asia, but also that the Court of Directors should be empowered to send out schoolmasters and persons for the religious and moral improvement of the native inhabitants of the British Dominions in India. The Directors naturally took alarm at this, so all these resolutions in favour of turning a trading Company into a missionary Society were omitted on the third reading of the Bill. When the time came for the Charter to be once more renewed in 1813, a fresh effort was made by William Wilberforce and his party to insert the clauses which had been rejected in 1793 and to commit the Company to the provision of a regular missionary establishment. At the same time they also advocated the appointment of a Bishop and three Archdeacons in order to supply more adequately the spiritual needs of the Company's Christian servants in India. Both these proposals led to violent controversies, and for three years before the time came for the renewing of the Charter there was a regular war of pamphlets and tracts. It is said that as many as 900 petitions were presented to the Houses of

<sup>1</sup> *The Church in Madras*, vol. i ch. ix p. 181.



Parliament between March and July 1813 from various towns and parishes all over the country. Many of them simply asked that facilities should be given to missionaries who desired to go to India to communicate to its people useful knowledge and religious teaching; but a large number supported the proposals of 1793 that the Company should itself appoint and pay for a Church establishment for the purpose of carrying on missionary work among the natives of India. It was unfortunate that the question of the appointment of a Bishop and Archdeacons should have been mixed up with this unwise attempt to force upon the Company the work of a missionary society. Not unnaturally this proposal was interpreted in the light of the obnoxious clauses of 1793. The result was that, though many of the most experienced of the Company's servants, such as Warren Hastings, Lord Teignmouth and William Cooper, stated before the Committee of the House of Commons that they saw no danger in the proposal, at the same time both Warren Hastings and William Cooper deprecated the appointment of a Bishop just at that particular time. When the question was discussed at a meeting of the General Court of Proprietors of East India Stock, the proposal to appoint a Bishop and Archdeacons was violently opposed. One of the shareholders urged that these additions to the Church establishment would be a temptation to the Chaplains to aspire to place, power and authority. He said he did not want to introduce into India 'that sort of high vaulting ambition which he knew to be inseparable from the possession of Church dignity.' Another shareholder objected that it would be impossible to keep Bishops and Archdeacons from interfering with the politics of India; while another took even stronger ground and asserted that he had never known a Bishop or an Archdeacon to forward religion!<sup>1</sup> However, in the end the clauses for the appointment of a missionary establishment were rejected, but a clause was accepted enacting that facilities ought to be afforded by law to

<sup>1</sup> *The Church in Madras*, vol. ii ch. i pp. 36, 37.

persons desirous of going to and remaining in India for the purpose of introducing among the natives of India useful knowledge and religious and moral improvement, and also clauses were passed for the appointment of a Bishop and three Archdeacons. To avoid the possibility of the Bishop interfering with the civil government it was specially provided that the Bishop's jurisdiction was to be limited by Letters Patent, and in order to make sure that the Bishop and the Archdeacons should not be wolves in sheep's clothing a further provision was made that they were not to take fees or perquisites or engage in trade. The Charter of 1813, therefore, inaugurated a new epoch in the relation of the Company to the missionaries and their congregations. Up to that time the Company had simply appointed Chaplains to minister to their own servants and dependents in their factories or their territories in India ; but when effect was given to the legislation of 1813, India was made a diocese, Letters Patent were issued and all the legal paraphernalia of the English Church were introduced into India under the aegis of the Company. The Bishop was given authority by his Letters Patent not only over the Chaplains appointed by the Company, but over all ministers and chaplains and all priests and deacons in Holy Orders of the United Church of England and Ireland resident in his diocese including the missionaries, and he was bound to exercise jurisdiction, spiritual and ecclesiastical, in his diocese 'according to the ecclesiastical laws of our realm of England.'

This produced a state of things which was undoubtedly anomalous. The Company became officially connected with the missionaries and their Indian congregations, and the Indian congregations came under the yoke of the ecclesiastical laws of England—a yoke that neither we nor our forefathers have been able to bear with any satisfaction. At the same time, anomalous though it was, the practical result has proved highly beneficial for all parties concerned. It has been a good thing for the Indian congregations to feel that they are part of a world-wide communion. Their union with the English congregations has helped to bring



home to them the catholicity of the Church and is preventing them from lapsing into a narrow nationalism. At the same time it has been equally good for the European congregations to feel that the Indian Christians are fellow-members of the one Body of Christ and to be made to realize that the Church is essentially a missionary body and cannot adopt a policy of religious neutrality. And it is good for the British Government in India that the Christian religion should thus be made an instrument for softening race prejudice and bridging the gulf that yawns between East and West. During the last hundred years these beneficial results of what might seem to some people the mistake of appointing Bishops under Letters Patent and of constituting India a Diocese by Act of Parliament have increased rather than diminished, so that even if it was a mistake we may well ejaculate '*O felix culpa!*'

## II

The relation between the State and the various Christian Churches in India has gradually developed on these lines for the last hundred years and has not been seriously challenged. There are, however, signs at the present day that it will be challenged in the immediate future. Two movements are tending to bring it into the arena of controversy.

In the first place there is a movement within the Church of England itself for self-government and independence. From a legal point of view the position of the Church of England in India is certainly most anomalous. It is theoretically a branch of the Church of England and subject to the ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England. When India and Ceylon were formed into a Diocese by Act of Parliament in 1813, it was intended that it should have precisely the same legal status as a diocese in England; but the attempt to transplant the legal system of the Church of England into India was hopeless from the very first, and has become more hopeless still as the Church has grown and developed in the course of the last century. At the present day

two-thirds of the Church of England in India consist of Indian Christians mainly drawn from the lowest classes of Hindu society in remote village districts. The circumstances and the needs of these poor and illiterate Indian Christians in the villages are wholly different from those of our Church people in England. To attempt to impose on them the ecclesiastical laws of the Church of England would be ludicrous in the extreme, and as a matter of fact no one has been foolish enough to attempt it; and even for the European section of the Church the legal system prescribed in the Letters Patent is an anachronism. The Bishops are empowered to hold ecclesiastical courts for the administration of discipline, but the law which they are bound to administer is a law which is now obsolete in England, and the procedure prescribed by the law is a procedure which no one in India understands and which cannot possibly be carried out. If, therefore, the Government were to insist that the laws of the Church of England should be strictly obeyed in India, the position would be intolerable. Happily, however, the legal system has been strongly tempered by common sense. The Bishops of the Province have constituted a Court of Equity, and by the exercise of the paternal authority inherent in the Episcopate have adapted the system of the Church of England to the special needs and circumstances of the various sections of the Indian Church. The services of the Prayer Book are freely modified to render them suitable to the village congregations; the discipline of the Church and the methods of administering it are in the same way adapted to the circumstances of the people. Throughout a large part of the Diocese of Madras each parish has its own Court for the administration of discipline. If any member of the congregation is guilty of any moral offence or disturbs the peace of the congregation he is summoned before the local Court and punished, or if he has committed a serious offence is recommended to the Bishop for excommunication. The whole procedure is modelled upon the ancient village Panchayats (committees of five) that have administered rough justice in Indian villages and managed the village affairs for centuries past,



and so it works admirably ; and in the same way Church Councils have been established for the administration of Church affairs which have no parallel in the Church of England at home. Thus the life of the Church in India is gradually being built up and developed by methods that lie outside the legal system of the Church of England, through the free exercise of the authority and jurisdiction of the Bishops. This system with all its anomalies has so far worked exceedingly well, and it cannot be said that from the point of view of the welfare of the Church there is any practical need for any change at the present time. It is impossible to point to any single thing of importance that needs doing for any section of the Church, European, Anglo-Indian or Indian, which cannot be done under existing conditions.

While, therefore, there is undoubtedly in certain quarters a strong desire for a definite legal constitution and for independence both of the State and of the Church of England, this desire does not arise out of the practical needs of the Church, but is due to causes which are academic and sentimental rather than practical. On the one hand the legal mind revolts against the legal anomalies of our present method of Church Government. It seems a dreadful thing that the Bishops should constantly be doing things which have no direct legal authority, and the legal mind cannot find comfort in the fact that nobody wants the law to be strictly observed, neither the Bishops nor the members of the Church nor the Government of India nor the Crown nor the Houses of Parliament, and that everybody concerned is quite content that the Bishops should do the best they can for the good of the Church outside the strict limits of the law. Then, on the other hand, there is in some parts of India a growing self-consciousness among the educated Indian Christians which leads them naturally to long for a national Church of India and to rebel against the attempt to establish in India a branch of the Church of England. 'Give us an Indian Church and we are willing to die for it,' said an Indian Christian at a meeting of the Bishops, clergy and laity which met at Calcutta two years ago ; and that

represents the feeling of a large number of educated Indian Christians.

Then, again, there is the belief which is held by some of the European missionaries that the connexion with the State is a distinct hindrance to the missionary work of the Church by giving it a foreign aspect and identifying it with a foreign Government.

It is impossible not to feel a great deal of sympathy with these reasons for upsetting the *status quo*. The desire for an Indian Christian Church is wholly laudable, and no one can doubt that sooner or later the legal connexion with the Church of England ought to be severed. It is possible also to sympathize to some extent with the legal view of the position. The existing state of things is undoubtedly anomalous and cannot continue indefinitely. But there are two practical considerations that need to be kept steadily in mind at the present time before any movement is started for a radical change in the existing system in the supposed interests of the Church itself.

The first, and overwhelmingly the most important, consideration is the paramount need of maintaining racial unity within the Church. The Church of England has a special mission in India in this respect, which does not belong, in anything like the same degree, to any other Church or religious community. It contains within its fold about 75 per cent. of the European population in India, about two-fifths of the Anglo-Indians or Eurasians and about one-twelfth of the Indian Christians. Roughly speaking the numbers are about 75,000 Europeans, 50,000 Anglo-Indians and 300,000 Indians. The special mission of the Church of England, therefore, is to unite these different races as members of the one Body, and in the face of the seemingly impassable barriers that separate Europeans and Indians, Hindus and Mahomedans and the different castes of Hindu society, to assert the great principle that in Christ Jesus there is neither Jew nor Gentile, Greek nor barbarian, bond nor free, but that all races and all classes are one in Christ Jesus. This is a splendid mission and a magnificent ideal for which it is worth making very great



sacrifices. And in considering the question of the right constitution and mode of government for the Church in India the main point to be kept in view is, what constitution and form of government will best enable the Church to uphold this great ideal? We need to remember that the difficulty of uniting these different elements in one Body is very great. They have different needs, different traditions and different aspirations. On the one hand the Europeans are temporary sojourners in India. They come out as members of the Church of England. If they are religious men and women, they are sincerely attached to the Church of their fathers and want to remain members of it while they are in India: they look forward to living and dying as members of the old Church when they retire and go back to England. This large and important section of the Church in India therefore has as a body no desire whatever to become members of an independent Indian Church; they do not want new forms of service, new laws or new methods of discipline. Some years ago I was talking to a distinguished member of the Indian Civil Service of Madras about possible changes in the Cathedral services in Madras. 'I do not want any change at all,' he replied, 'but I want the service to be exactly like the services at home.' That, I believe, roughly represents the general feeling of the Europeans in India, both civil and military, with regard not only to the Church services but to the Church arrangements and constitution generally.

Then, on the other hand, there are the Indian Christians whose needs and wishes are wholly different from those of the Europeans. They need an Indian Church with an Indian dress, Indian form of service and Indian methods of discipline: they want to express their religious ideas and feelings in their own way. And between these two extremes stand the Anglo-Indians or Eurasians, whose sympathies are strongly with the Europeans, but whose religious needs have strong affinities with those of the Indian Christians.

How are these different elements to be united together in one Body? It is obvious that the problem is not an

easy one. It is not at all certain that the Europeans as a body would consent to become members of an independent Indian Church with unlimited power of legislation and unlimited possibility of change, when they themselves would form a small and decreasing minority in all Church Synods and Councils. And if they did consent to come in, even so the situation would be full of difficulty. On the one hand no one system of legislation could be framed to satisfy the divergent needs of Europeans and Indians. On the other hand there would be serious objections to having one set of laws for the Indians and another for the Europeans. I believe myself that this difficult problem can be solved far more easily through the paternal jurisdiction of the Bishops than it could be under any written legal constitution. We need as informal and elastic a system as possible, and nothing could be more informal or elastic than the present system which is practically based on the authority of the Bishops, and it is for this reason that with all its anomalies it works so well. On the whole, therefore, I believe that it would be our wisdom to retain it as long as possible.

The second consideration which we ought to keep in mind is the financial question. It is, perhaps, one of minor importance, but still it cannot be ignored. If the Church is to be independent both of the State and of the Church of England and is to have a perfect freedom to legislate for itself, the first thing needed is that the State should cease to appoint and pay the Bishops and that the whole legal paraphernalia of Letters Patent and Acts of Parliament should be swept away. The fact that the State appoints and pays Chaplains to minister to its servants, military and civil, would not necessarily create any serious difficulty ; but on the other hand it is impossible for the Church in India to have independence and free power of legislating for itself, so long as its Bishops are appointed by the State under Letters Patent or are controlled by the State : and it is not reasonable to ask that the State should continue to appoint and pay Bishops who are to be members of an independent Indian Church over which the State has



absolutely no control. When, therefore, we form plans for the establishment of an Indian Church in India, which shall belong to the Anglican communion and yet shall have perfect freedom to frame its own laws and constitution, we must face the fact that it will have to pay for its own Bishops. At the present moment, as we have already noticed, out of the thirteen Bishops in the Province of India and Ceylon three are appointed by the State and entirely paid by the State, namely Calcutta, Madras and Bombay; four are appointed by the State and paid half by the State and half by endowments raised by private subscriptions, namely Lucknow, Lahore, Nagpur and Rangoon; one, namely Travancore and Cochin, is appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and paid by the Church Missionary Society; while five are neither appointed nor paid by the State, namely Assam, Chota Nagpur, Dornakal, Colombo, and Tinnevely and Madura.

If, therefore, the Church in India were entirely to sever its legal connexion with the State, it would have to provide the whole of the salaries of the three Presidency Bishops of Calcutta, Madras and Bombay and half the salaries of four other Bishops together with various diocesan expenses which are now paid by the Government. Allowing for all this, the least that the Church would need to furnish, if all State aid were withdrawn, would be about £14,000 a year. It is possible that the Government would make grants to some of the Bishops for work done on behalf of the State in the same way as it now makes grants to some of the Roman Catholic Bishops throughout India. But these would probably not amount to more than about £4000 a year at the most. In the most favourable circumstances, therefore, the additional burden thrown upon the Church, if the State ceased to appoint and pay the Bishops, would be about £10,000 a year. It would obviously not be impossible for the Church in India, with the assistance of the Church at home, to bear this extra burden. It might mean the curtailment of a certain amount of its philanthropic work in India and possibly a reduction in the number of the European missionaries; but it would be

quite possible with an effort to find the money. Still for all that, considering the poverty of the Church in India, a burden of £10,000 a year is not to be taken up lightly and unadvisedly.

The second movement which is tending to bring forward for discussion the relation between the Church and the State in India is a purely political one. During the last few years educated Indians have been rapidly acquiring greater power and influence in the government of the country and they are strongly imbued with the political ideas of the Liberal Party in England. The result is that they are tending to look with a very critical eye both at the relation between the Government of India and the Church of England and also at the support given by the Government to various missionary institutions. They are more and more coming to look at these questions in the light of the cry for disestablishment in England and the educational controversies of the last twenty years. The first point of attack will be the Government grants that are given to missionary schools and colleges. The theory of Government is that these grants are made solely on account of the secular education given in these institutions. The Government profess entirely to ignore the religious teaching given in them ; they make no inquiries about it and look upon it as entirely outside the scope of the ordinary school curriculum. Still the fact remains that in almost all missionary schools and colleges attendance at the religious instruction is compulsory. It is also the fact that in many areas the missionary school is the only high school available, and that the Government have refused to allow any other high schools to be established. What many of the educated Indians are now demanding is that the Government should refuse to give grants to any school or college unless there is a conscience clause making attendance at the religious teaching optional. This demand has been urged with much force in a pamphlet recently published by Mr. Srinivasa Sastri, who succeeded the late Mr. Gokhale as head of the Servants of India Society. He fully admits the valuable



work done by the missionaries in the sphere of education, and says that 'the people who benefited by the mission organization look on them with gratitude and admiration.' On the other hand he protests vigorously against State grants being given to any educational institutions in which Christian teaching is made compulsory, and he not unreasonably appeals to the principles so strongly asserted by the Nonconformists and the Liberal Party with reference to State grants to denominational schools in England.

The ecclesiastical establishment of the Government stands on quite a different footing from the grants to mission schools and colleges. Few people would question the justice and expediency of the Government providing adequate religious ministrations for its own Christian servants; and the ecclesiastical establishment exists for no other purpose. At the same time it must be frankly admitted that even from this point of view the position of the State-paid Bishops of the Church of England in India is open to criticism. It is quite true that they are appointed and paid by the State to minister to the Christian servants of the Government, but at the same time by virtue of their position as Bishops they are the heads of a Church of which the Government servants form only a small minority; and as every Christian Church, so far as it is faithful to its commission, is bound to be a missionary body, the Bishops cannot do their duty as Bishops of the Church of Christ unless they take an active interest and an active part in the missionary work of the Dioceses over which they rule. From this point of view, therefore, the State grants for the appointment of the Bishops stand on very much the same footing as the State grants to mission schools and colleges. In each case the grants are made by Government for non-missionary work, but undoubtedly they go to support institutions which are essentially missionary. The position taken up by the State in both cases is that, on the one hand, they pay for the secular education given in the schools and have nothing whatever to do with the religious teaching, and that, on the other hand, they pay for the work which the Bishops do among the civil

and military servants of Government and have nothing whatever to do with any extra work that the Bishops choose to undertake in their leisure hours. The position undoubtedly is quite a tenable one; at the same time it is open to the criticism which Lord Morley made on a similar position in England in his book on *The Struggle for National Education*. He maintains that it is a palpable fallacy to say that the State aid does nothing for the sectarian part of the instruction, since a payment without which an institution could not subsist, though it may be nominally made for a special purpose, is and must be a payment for the institution as a whole. The same criticism is being made on the grants given in India to mission schools and colleges and for the salaries of the Bishops.

Any attacks made, however, on the State grants to Christian institutions or for the ecclesiastical establishment in India will inevitably raise a much wider question, which is one of extreme delicacy. The Christian Church is not the only religious body which has received grants from Government. In past centuries enormous grants have been made by both Hindu and Mahommedan Governments all over India for the support of Hindu and Mahommedan institutions. These grants were continued by the East India Company and afterwards by the British Government when they acquired the sovereignty of India. They are given largely in the shape of annual remissions of the land-tax on lands held by various religious institutions and corporations, and partly also in the form of large grants of lands.

It is often argued that these grants to Hindu and Mahommedan institutions stand on quite a different footing from the payments made by the State to Christian institutions on the ground that they were not made originally by the British Government but were taken over by them from former Hindu or Mahommedan Governments. This distinction, however, can hardly be maintained with any show of reason. Those who assert that it is wrong in principle for a Christian Government to make grants from public money to Christian institutions can hardly maintain that



it was quite right for Hindu Governments to make grants to Hindu institutions. If the one is wrong in principle so is the other, and if the grants to Christian Churches ought to be discontinued as being wrong in principle, the grants to Hindu temples and Brahman Agraharams ought to be withdrawn for the same reason. This raises a question of tremendous importance, and it will be much wiser both for the Government and for Indian politicians to let it alone. I cannot imagine that the Government of India would ever be rash enough to propose the withdrawal of all the grants to Hindu shrines and temples all over India. Nothing would be more calculated to produce widespread discontent among the great mass of the people in town and village. It would almost certainly create a revolution. At the same time it would be very difficult for the Government to justify their position if they discontinued grants to Christian institutions on the ground that it is wrong in principle for the State to make grants from public money for religious purposes and then continued these enormous grants to Hindu and Mahommedan institutions. Also it must be admitted that it would ill become Hindus and Mahommedans to keep tight hold of the large grants given to their religious institutions by Hindu and Mahommedan rulers in past years and then to raise objections to the moderate grants made by the British Government for the purpose of providing religious ministrations to its own Christian servants.

### III

It is not probable, therefore, that the question of the disestablishment of the Bishops will be raised in the near future by the Nationalist Party. Their first point of attack will be the grants to mission schools and colleges, and even here they will not demand the discontinuance of the grants, but only the introduction of a conscience clause. They do not object, as Mr. Srinivasa Sastri's pamphlet shews, to grants being made to Christian institutions, but to Hindus and Mahommedans being obliged in single-school areas

to send their children to schools in which attendance at the religious teaching given for the avowed purpose of converting the pupils to Christianity is made compulsory. It is difficult to see how the Liberal Party in England and the English Nonconformists can set aside this objection and reject the demand for a conscience clause, at any rate in single-school areas, if it is pressed. And the only consideration that may prevent its being pressed is the strong probability that a conscience clause would lead to a large number of the mission schools and colleges being closed. On the other hand there is no practical grievance involved in the payment of the Bishops by the State. In a pamphlet on the subject of the ecclesiastical establishment written about forty years ago by the late Sir Theodore Hope it was pointed out that in South India the individual Indian Christian pays much more for the support of Hinduism and Mahomedanism than the individual Hindu and Mahomedan pays for the support of Christianity. And it is also true that the position of the Bishops as Government officials is of some value even to the Hindus and Mahomedans. It is an outward and visible sign to them of the religious character of the Government, and while it may be true that the Hindus would prefer a Hindu Government and the Mahomedans a Mahomedan Government, neither Hindus nor Mahomedans want a purely secular Government. This was shewn in rather a striking way at the last Delhi Durbar. Some of the English officials responsible for the arrangements were very unwilling at first to have any public religious service at the Durbar for fear of offending the religious susceptibilities of the Hindus and Mahomedans. As a matter of fact both Hindus and Mahomedans were greatly pleased that the service was held, and one of the most orthodox of the Rajput Princes in North India sent the Bishop of Lahore a donation of £11 for his Diocesan Fund next day as 'a thanksgiving for the service.'

If any move is made for the disestablishment of the Bishops, therefore, it will probably not come from without but from within the Church. And for my own part I think that Churchmen would be very ill-advised indeed to raise



the question. I have given above my reasons for thinking that it is not a question of urgent practical importance, and that if it were pressed forward the probable result would be to split the Church asunder and divide it on racial lines. To my mind that would be nothing less than a catastrophe. It would introduce a new element of division into the Indian Church infinitely worse than any of the divisions brought to her from the West. There is something to be said for divisions based on religious convictions; there is nothing to be said for divisions based on race and caste. But if once we establish the principle that there ought to be one Church for the European and another for the Indian, the inevitable conclusion will be that there ought also to be one Church for the Brahman, another for the Kyasth, another for the Sudra and another for the Outcaste. Already you may see in many villages of South India, where there are Roman Catholic congregations, one large church for the higher castes and a few yards off another large church for the lower castes. It would require only a little encouragement to lead Indian Christians to adopt the principle 'one caste, one Church.' To run any risk whatever, therefore, of breaking up the unity of the Church of England in India would seem to me to be almost criminal folly, and for my own part I would far rather submit patiently to any amount of legal anomaly and even to much practical inconvenience than risk a disaster which would strike a fatal blow at Indian Christianity.

What we need in India at present is not any radical change in the constitution of the Church, but rather quiet and steady development on existing lines. We have already a Provincial Synod consisting of all the Bishops of the Province, which has done most useful work for the last forty years. We can supplement that by the establishment of a Provincial Council composed of the Bishops and representatives of the clergy and laity of each diocese. We can also carry forward our diocesan organization. The circumstances of various dioceses are not by any means the same, and so their needs as regards diocesan organization are widely different. In some dioceses it will be possible and desirable

to establish at once a Diocesan Council with extensive powers of administration : in others the function of the Diocesan Council will be consultative rather than administrative. But in all cases the basis of the whole system of Councils will be the paternal authority of the Bishops. What we need at the present stage of development is on the one hand to avoid raising fundamental questions with regard to our constitution which might endanger the unity of the Church, and on the other hand to secure the utmost possible freedom for the development of the Indian Christian congregations. These two needs can be best satisfied for the present by remaining content with our existing constitution with all its strange anomalies.

HENRY MADRAS.

---

ART. II.—SCIENCE, ETHICS AND ART :  
A SYNOPTIC PHILOSOPHY.

1. *A History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century.* By JOHN THEODORE MERZ. Four volumes. (Edinburgh : W. Blackwood and Sons. 1896-1914.)
2. *On a General Tendency of Thought during the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century.* By the same. 'Transactions of the University of Durham Philosophical Society,' May 1910. (Newcastle-on-Tyne : A. Reid and Co.)
3. *On the Synoptic Aspect of Reality.* By the same. 'Transactions of the University of Durham Philosophical Society,' February 1913. (Newcastle-on-Tyne : A. Reid and Co.)

DR. MERZ' work is, as its title declares, a history of thought in the Nineteenth century. Every history is necessarily written from some point of view, and reveals the writer's point of view. In the course of a history of thought, a theory of thought reveals itself. The nature of Dr. Merz'



theory is intimated by the words from Plato which he sets upon the fly-leaf : ὁ μὲν γὰρ συνοπτικός διαλεκτικός, ὁ δὲ μὴ οὐ. He has called it ' the Synoptic view,' synopsis being contrasted with the combined process of analysis and synthesis, ' the former taking in at a glance the totality of a complex subject, the latter dissecting the same into its parts and then attempting to bring them together again to a united whole.' This tendency to take the synoptic view, ' to look at things as a whole and not in their isolation or their parts,' Dr. Merz discovers to be clearly marked not only in philosophical but also in scientific thought. His *History* however was not written with the object of proving the generalization for which he has invented the term, the synoptic view. This generalization ' emerged only at the end of the composition of the text as a very broad induction resting upon a large amount of detail.' Hence it was only during the process of revising his work that Dr. Merz came to fix on a term for this, the synoptic view, and to refer to it, for the most part only in notes, by this name.

The object of this article is simply to consider ' the synoptic view,' not to review the *History of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century*. Readers of Dr. Merz' great work can but feel, with Professor A. E. Taylor, that it ' is the noble achievement of a noble task and will remain a κτῆμα ἐς αἰὲν for all students of the development of thought through one of its most important eras.'<sup>1</sup>

Then, is philosophy merely a contemplation of truth ? Does it involve feeling (in the apprehension of the good and the beautiful), or does it stand icily aloof, professing to have no feelings, or even looking with suspicion on feeling as tending to pervert the judgement and to prevent us from seeing the cold intellectual truth ? Does it affect our action—is its object to enable us to act in a way in which otherwise we should not have acted ?

Evidently, it is not the function of philosophy to do the work of the man of science or of the artist, but to survey it. This is implied in the view that philosophy is synoptic :

<sup>1</sup> *Mind*, July 1915, p. 412.

philosophy has to contemplate not only the truths of science, but the value which the good and the beautiful have. Then, does philosophy simply survey truths and values—does it simply contemplate them with a vacuous gaze, seeing them exactly as science, art and morality present them, and leaving them exactly as presented? If philosophy does this, it does nothing: its presence has no more effect than its absence—it enables us neither to think nor to act otherwise than we should have done had it been non-existent.

Thus to say that philosophy is synoptic enables us to include art and morality as well as science in the field to be surveyed by philosophy, but apparently the survey yields no results—the objects in the field of vision remain what they are, whether surveyed or not, and the surveyor's mind is but a mirror in which the objects are reflected exactly as presented by science, art and morality. If the result of the survey conducted by the synoptic philosopher is necessarily that he leaves things where they are, philosophy is a work of supererogation. It is no use seeing things together if the result is that they appear just the same as when they are contemplated separately.

On the other hand, if we suppose the result of seeing them together to be that we shall see them better and in a truer light, then it follows that the view presented by science simply or by art simply or by morality merely is not wholly sufficient or adequate—that the scientific view (or the artistic or the moral) is not final, and consequently is not by itself an adequate basis for action, that is for a mode of life.

The justification then for a synoptic philosophy, for the attempt to see all things together, is the conviction or assumption that seen separately they are not seen truly—not seen as they really are. Science (or art or morals) sees one aspect of things, or sees things under one aspect; and it voluntarily and deliberately attends to that one aspect alone. It counts things, as though number were their only property; or weighs them, etc., as though they had weight, etc., alone. It abstracts the particular property,

or set of properties, which it studies ; and it confines itself to that particular abstraction. The painter confines his attention to the colour and form of things ; the moralist to the relation of actions to the good of mankind. Science, ethics and aesthetics are all in this way and to some extent abstract. And it is because they abstract certain qualities, or dwell exclusively on certain aspects, or see certain things separately and apart from the complex in which they actually exist, that they do not see things truly, as they really are.

Yet the fact remains that abstraction is a method by which we are continually brought to see things more truly, more as they really are : it is a path which leads not away from truth but to it. A body does not fall 16 feet in the first second, 32 in the next, and so on. Yet this abstract conception enables us to understand the fall of bodies more correctly than was possible before the discovery of the law of gravitation. By abstraction we approximate to the direction of the truth, even if, by its very nature, abstraction is for ever distinct from concrete truth and fact.

The complex of concrete actual happenings is what exists before abstraction starts ; it is that from which science, art and morals make their abstractions, and to it the principles abstracted by them are eventually applied. What room then is left and where for philosophy ? Applied science does not require the assistance or intervention of philosophy ; neither is philosophy required to enable us to apply the principles of art or morality. And if the world of actual happenings were not a complex, then abstract principles, whether of art, morality or science, might be applied with success straightway to the facts of life. But they are a complex and to none of them does science alone apply, or art or morality alone, just as the man who applies them is himself a complex and is only temporarily and by an effort of dismissal and concentration a pure scientist, artist or moralist.

If then life is a complex, and the man who lives it is a complex, some unity (whether greater or less) there must be in each. With this unity it is that philosophy and the



philosopher are concerned ; and from this unity it is that the principles of science, art and morality are abstracted ; and, because they are abstractions from the whole, no one of them (whether scientific, moral or artistic) is capable of explaining the whole. Such explanation therefore as we can give of the whole is what is meant by a philosophic explanation—by philosophy. Science may give a scientific explanation of things—or art an artist's view—but science or art can only set forth the scientific or artistic aspect of things. Those aspects, if regarded as existing separately, are abstractions ; and man does not move or live or have his being in abstractions ; neither he nor the life he lives—though they form a complex—is a complex composed of abstractions put together : abstractions are abstracted from the complex.

It is with the complex, and not with abstractions from it, that philosophy has to do. And it is with the unity which may be detected in the complex that philosophy is especially concerned, just as it is the unity of the whole which the scientist, artist or moralist dismisses from attention. If any unity is to be detected in things, then the things must be seen together—synopsis is necessary. Synopsis is, indeed, to a certain extent, necessary for the student of science, aesthetics or ethics : but each of them only has to see together certain things—the things he is interested in—not all things together. Further, each of them looks at the things he is interested in for the purpose of discovering or erecting abstract principles from them ; and it is easy and tempting to imagine that the philosopher in his turn looks at the abstract principles of science, art, and morality, for the purpose of discovering principles yet more abstract. Philosophy then is regarded as the most abstract of all studies, that which deals with the highest abstractions.

From this point of view philosophy appears as the science of sciences. But if it is so, then it is in the end but science carried to a higher degree of abstraction ; and, though this conception naturally approves itself to those who hold that by science alone can truth be attained, yet it excludes from philosophy everything but science—it excludes art and

morality, and implies that the only value there can possibly be is truth-value. This view therefore is sharply distinguished from the view that philosophy is synoptic, that in things there is a unity which may be discovered and can only be detected if we look at all things and not at the things of science alone, or rather can only be detected if we look at things in all their aspects instead of looking only at those aspects of them which science selects, that is abstracts, for consideration.

The view that science alone, and eventually the science of sciences, can give a final and satisfactory explanation of things, seems therefore to rest ultimately on the assumption that science deals with things and not merely with certain aspects of things, or that there are no other aspects than those with which science deals or may hereafter deal even though it has as yet not addressed itself to them. The 'science of morality' is already a current phrase, indicative of the advance of science in this direction; and perhaps a 'science of art' may yet emerge.

But even on this line of argument it is clear that, as each science deals with one aspect, or group of aspects, of things, there yet remains the necessity of a comprehensive glance which shall see the various aspects together: synopsis is still necessary. And the synoptic method evidently differs from the scientific in this respect, *viz.* that each science confines itself to one aspect of things, whereas synopsis is the attempt to grasp all their aspects, or rather to see things as they are.

Evidently 'aspects' are as much in the beholder as in the things seen. The difference between the scientist and the philosopher—or at any rate the synoptic philosopher—lies in the way in which they look at things; the things are the same—what is different is the way in which they are looked at, the aspect. One way is to look at things whole, and in their relation to the whole; another is to concentrate attention on some one of their parts and to abstract it for consideration along with other abstractions of a similar kind. Looked at in the one way, that is to say, looked at together, things are aspects—various aspects—of one whole.

If they are looked at in the other way, as similar to some but different from most other things, it remains to be seen whether the difference or the resemblance is fundamental—whether things are or are not parts of one and the same whole.

But the question whether things are really parts or aspects of one whole can only be raised after the work of abstraction has begun. Until certain things, or aspects of things, are abstracted for separate consideration, what is given is a complex. The complex is what is 'given' in the first instance. From its aspects, or from the aspects we have of it, some may be abstracted ; but the complex must be there if we are to distinguish its various aspects or to abstract them. And even when we have abstracted and distinguished them, the complex is still there—and so too the question is there, whether our abstractions and distinctions have enabled us to comprehend the complex any the better. From it we start and to it we return. We depart from it in order to return to it bringing our harvest with us. We leave it only in order that when we return to it we may the better understand it. The abstractions of science are made only in order to enable us to deal with the complex more efficaciously. And so far as satisfaction is to be got out of, or by means of, the material elements in the complex, science has enabled us to deal with it very efficaciously.

But the satisfaction thus to be attained is not the only satisfaction we seek : there are the demands of morality and art to be satisfied. Them science cannot satisfy. That simple fact we may take as a starting point, if we wish to consider what, if anything, is left for philosophy to do, when, if ever, science has done its perfect work.

Though each science deals with a particular property of things, or set of properties, and is in that sense, in the sense that it deals with them alone, abstract, still, in dealing with a property common to various things, it deals with the resemblances that exist between things ; and, in virtue of the resemblances discovered it is able to erect general laws. It discovers uniformity in nature and, so far, a unity in things. But the object of a synoptic philosopher is to see



things together, to see the unity in things. It would seem therefore that both science and philosophy are synoptic, and that philosophy is but science carried higher. And if science—pure and applied—were the only activity of man, this might well be the case. But truth is not the only object to which man's activity is addressed : he strives also after the good and the beautiful. And all his efforts and their results must be taken into account by anything that professes to be a synopsis, and not merely those which are concerned with truth.

If it be suggested that it is possible to give a scientific account of man's striving after the good and the beautiful, and that therefore his efforts to attain these two values are capable of scientific treatment, the reply is that, even so, the cases are not, as the suggestion implies, parallel. For, if it is possible to give a scientific account of his striving after goodness and beauty, it is also possible to give a scientific account of his struggles after truth. But the account of his struggles after truth—of the growth of science—would not be science, any more than the account of his striving after the good, or after the beautiful, would be goodness or beauty. The account, in each of the three cases, would be history ; and the fact that it is possible to give an historic account of them does not prove that they are all three of them forms of science any more than it proves they are all three of them forms or species of beauty or goodness. If all three are species, then the genus of which they are species is not any one of them. A synoptic view must look upon them as species of one genus, or rather as different manifestations or aspects of the same unity, or at any rate, of one complex.

Then is a synoptic philosophy to look—and merely look—at science, art and morality ? Is it to look at each separately, and, having done so, to draw no inferences, or (what comes to much the same thing) to infer that they are, essentially, separate and disparate ? To say so, is to hold in effect that synopsis is impossible, that the three cannot be comprehended in the same glance, that the assumption on which synoptic philosophy rests—the assumption that they

are manifestations or aspects of a unity—is, if not baseless, at any rate one to which the facts will simply not submit. To this we may reply by putting a question : are the facts facts ? or are what are supposed to be irreconcilable not facts but abstractions—the abstractions offered to us by science, morals and art ?

It is clear that science, ethics and aesthetics are all abstract forms of thought or ways of thinking. It is clear also that they are independent growths—that they have grown up independently of one another and are regarded as being independent of one another. It is clear again that it is not for the philosopher to consider whether the abstractions have been reached correctly—it is for the scientist alone to criticize, correct and enlarge science or rather the abstractions of science.

Neither again is it for the philosopher to make practical applications of the abstractions of either science, ethics or aesthetics : it is for the artist, the moralist and the man of applied science to do that. But—it is important to notice—practical applications of any of the three kinds of abstractions are made with a purpose, and the work of the professional man is to carry out the purpose—not to form, control, or criticize it. It—the purpose—is not supplied by science or ethics or aesthetics. Only when the purpose exists are the abstract principles of science, ethics or aesthetics applied or applicable in order to carry out the purpose. The purpose originates not in them but in the complex from which they have been abstracted. It is from the complex they were drawn, it is to the complex that they are applied ; and they were drawn from it and applied to it for the realization of purposes which exist only in the complex of actual life.

Science, ethics and aesthetics exist not for their own sake but to assist in the realization of some purpose of actual life ; and though every purposed action may be judged from the point of view of either science, ethics or aesthetics, a judgement which proceeds solely from any one of these three points of view is but an imperfect and one-sided judgement. Such a judgement is imperfect and one-sided precisely

because every purposed action has not only the aspect from which such a judgement views it, but also the two other aspects from which it may be viewed. To look at it only in one of the aspects is to see not the thing itself but an abstraction. To judge a man exclusively from any one of the three points of view—by any one exclusively of the three criteria—would be to misjudge him ; and in his purposed actions it is the man—the whole man—who acts, not any abstraction. And it is precisely the whole complex—whether man or the complex (society or the world) to which he belongs—that a synoptic philosophy strives to see. It seeks to transcend the imperfect judgements passed from any one of the three points of view, to get away from abstractions, and to close with the complex reality from which the abstractions have been drawn (though drawn for no other object than to enable us to return to the complex).

In other words, the object of a synoptic philosophy is not to remain content with the abstractions of science, aesthetics and ethics, or to accept them as ultimate and unchangeable, but to return to the complex, and to return to it not with the object of merely contemplating it but of dealing practically with it.

As, in every purposed action, it is the whole man who acts, a synoptic philosophy seeks to see the purposive agent, man, as a whole, and not merely to contemplate him, or the complex to which he belongs, not merely to assist him to his purposes (as science, ethics and aesthetics do), but to enable him, if not to form his purpose, then to understand it more clearly. When, however, we say that the business of philosophy is to help man to understand his purpose more clearly, two assumptions are made : first, that man has a purpose, and next that the purpose, being only partly clear to him, is not wholly his. And the mention of these assumptions may serve to lead us to inquire, what is the relation of philosophy to religion.

The philosopher differs from the non-philosopher, but the complex world of reality with which both have to do is the same. To imagine that the one has to do solely with abstract principles and lives in a realm of abstractions, pure



and undefiled, while the other lives, a complex being, in a complex world, is to do justice to neither of them. The problem of life which is presented to the one is presented also to the other, and each deals with it as best he may. The difference between them lies in the ways in which they approach it, and that difference is one of degree, not of kind. No man is wholly without philosophy, is entirely a non-philosopher : every man deals with the problem of life, but some men deal with it after less reflexion, some after more. The reflexion, whether greater or less, is an attempt to see life and the world as a whole—it is a synoptic philosophy. But the attempt may be abandoned, almost at once, or it may be prolonged ; and, if prolonged, it receives the name of philosophy. In either case—after a short attempt or a long study—the man returns to the complex world of endeavour, of action, of reality. But, in the one case he returns bringing with him little, in the other bringing a little more, that may help him to deal with the problem of life. The little more that the philosopher brings, we suggest, is the realization first that science, ethics and aesthetics grow independently of one another, for the simple reason that each of them deals with abstractions ; and next that, in the complex from which they are abstracted, there is no such independence—the reality from which they are abstracted is nowhere, in no part of it, fully to be comprehended whether by science alone, or ethics alone, or aesthetics alone.

These three ways of thinking, or modes of investigation, are from this point of view co-ordinate with one another ; and they are, all of them, subordinate to philosophy. They are subordinate only in the sense that the philosopher does, whereas the non-philosopher does not, make full and conscious use of them for the purpose of attempting to solve the problem of life. They are not subordinate in the sense that philosophy undertakes to solve the special problems of any one of the three—say, of science. To say that would be to pass sentence of death on philosophy. If philosophy said it, it would be suicide ; for science to say it, as some men of science do, is the murder of philosophy.

But philosophy need neither be murdered nor commit suicide, if it confines itself to the work of attempting to solve the problem of life, *viz.* with what purpose are we here? The question then, however, at once arises as to the relation of philosophy to religion, for religion also is concerned with the problem of the purpose of life.

The religious solution of the problem is that we are here to do God's will, to make His will ours; and that we shall know His will, if with all our hearts we love God, and love our neighbour as ourselves. If, then, philosophy and religion address themselves to the same problem, and religion solves it, philosophy in that case becomes what most non-philosophers consider it—useless and superfluous. In that case, that is to say, philosophy suffers the same fate at the hands of the man of religion as at the hands of the man of science: neither of them wants it; each of them, from his own point of view, can dispense with it. Philosophy cannot solve—it does not pretend to solve—scientific problems; and, as regards the problem of life, religion is not in search of a solution but has already found it. What, then, shall we say of philosophy—has it also found the solution?

Various systems of philosophy have at different times been offered as solving the problem, and for a time have been accepted as having solved it, but only for a time: permanence there has been in none of them. For this historical fact good reason can be found, if we regard the business of philosophy as being synoptic. Man's knowledge of the complex of reality in which he moves and of which he, himself a complex being, is part, is daily increasing; and the complex which he seeks to know is itself not changeless but every day brings forth something new. The whole neither is nor at any time can be present to the mind of man. Of what is present he can try, if he is a synoptic philosopher, to take a comprehensive view—comprehensive but never final. The mistaken notion that a final view is possible is the fallacy at the root of the philosophical systems which have professed dogmatically to solve the problem of life—and, having enjoyed their little day of

dogma, have passed away. For those then who can neither look to philosophy for any dogmatic solution of the problem of life, nor yet forsake philosophy, it remains to consider what can be claimed for philosophy when dogmatism has been abjured.

To begin with, a philosophy which, while synoptic, renounces all pretension that its synopsis is final, bears towards religion a relation more satisfactory than that occupied by any dogmatic system of philosophy. A philosophy which professes dogmatically to have solved the problem of life offers a solution which must either be or not be identical with the religious solution. If identical, then, on the one hand, for the religious man who is not a philosopher it has no practical value—so far as he is concerned, it leaves things as they were; for the philosopher, on the other hand, the religious grounds for belief become superfluous—he has grounds other, and to him more satisfactory, than are the religious grounds. Were his not more satisfactory he would neither have sought them, nor would he accept them. That becomes quite clear when the solution reached by a dogmatic philosophy is other than the religious solution, for then the dogmatic philosopher prefers the solution offered by philosophy.

Thus the solution reached by a dogmatic system of philosophy is either identical with the religious solution, in which case the religious solution is superfluous to the philosopher, and the philosophic solution is superfluous to the religious man; or the solutions are different, and then philosophy and religion are at variance. In fine, from the very nature of a dogmatic philosophy, that is from its dogmatic nature, it is impossible for its relation to religion to be satisfactory.

In what relation then does a philosophy which abjures dogmatism stand to religion? The renunciation of dogmatism means the renunciation of any claim to having reached finality. A synoptic philosophy is a survey of knowledge, as far as it extends at the time of survey, accompanied by a recognition of the fact that knowledge is ever extending in ways and directions which we cannot



foresee, and consequently ever accompanied by the consciousness that any and every such survey holds good only provisionally. But, for the religious man, religion is not something provisional : it is final. The religious man thus rests at a point to which the philosopher, if he is not a dogmatist, does not and never can attain. The ground upon which the man of religion stands is faith : his standing-ground is a fixed point. The knowledge, on which the philosopher moves, is a moving wave, the direction of which cannot long be foreseen—for the wind bloweth where it listeth. Religion surveys life from the point of view of sure and certain faith, philosophy from the point of view of hypothesis, acknowledged to be hypothesis.

A synoptic philosopher, therefore, of necessity includes religion in his survey, for his object is to see the whole, and to see it as a unity ; but, since he is not a dogmatist, he sees it from the point of view of hypothesis, and, consequently, does not claim finality for his survey. If from his survey he drew no conclusions, his labour in making the survey would be fruitless, pointless and without object or purpose. But he has an object and purpose—to see the unity in things, to see them together, in their *ensemble*, in their relation to one another. Consequently he cannot regard religion, science, morality and art as fundamentally at variance, he cannot leave them in a welter : he wants to see them together and to realize their unity, and he seeks some hypothesis which will—if only provisionally—enable him to see them ordered. They present themselves at first sight as so many independent growths ; but on examination science, ethics and aesthetics prove to be independent growths only because they deal in abstractions and feed on abstractions.

To realize this let us first look at scientific thought. The range of facts and phenomena, contemplated by science, has, as Dr. Merz points out, been put into order and described by means of a few highest principles or generalizations—the uniformities termed natural laws. Thus a comparative unity or system of nature has been reached by science. But, as Dr. Merz goes on to say, the

unity or system thus arrived at is 'a purely logical one, which through application and actual verification, through calculation and prediction of unknown facts and future events, has received the impress of reality.' It is however only the impress of reality : 'in stating ever so completely the uniformities and regularities of natural facts and events we are dealing only with an abstraction.'

If it is true to say, with Dr. Merz, that science deals only in abstractions, it is also equally true to say that it is with abstractions alone that ethics deals. 'The substance and essence of Christian morality,' as Dr. Merz says, 'are the very simple commandments of the New Testament, Love your Maker, and Love your Brother.' Ethics deals with the latter by itself, apart from the former, that is as an abstraction ; and, doubtless, for the purpose of ethics, as for the purpose of science, abstraction is both legitimate and useful. The mistake consists in imagining that abstractions can stand by themselves, in mistaking the shadow for the substance, in supposing that the second of these two supreme commandments can stand, if the first be discarded. Dr. Merz' view is that, if the first article of Christian morality be cancelled, 'the second article is deprived of that sanction and authority through which it rises to the dignity of being, for every member of human society, an obligation and a duty.' It makes ethics a search, and, as it seems to Dr. Merz, a fruitless search, 'for a new sanction, a new authority to take the place of that which has been destroyed.' As thus conceived, ethics, like science, deals only with an abstraction. 'Morality,' Dr. Merz says, 'cannot permanently live and grow except on a spiritual foundation.' If this foundation be destroyed it is difficult to see how either the Good or the True is to survive, how either morality or science is to retain its footing. Dr. Merz says :

'It is with a true insight into the connection of ideas that Guyau and others have pointed out that if the spirit of toleration makes it desirable, that religious dogma be done away with and the dogmatic spirit be destroyed, this will ultimately and necessarily be followed by a negation not only of religious dogmas

but likewise of the sense of duty, and finally of moral distinctions themselves. Here it is difficult not to ask the question whether there is not a still more fundamental assumption, postulate or axiom—whatever we call it—which will follow in the wake of this general collapse, *viz.* Truth.'

It is not necessary to dwell on the fact that aesthetics, like ethics and science, deals with abstractions. It is, however, advisable to point out that all three are parallel to one another, inasmuch as it is with abstractions that all three deal. It is advisable to call attention to the parallelism, because Dr. Merz holds that as between ethics and aesthetics the parallel breaks down. We distinguish between good and bad; and we distinguish between the beautiful and the ugly; and so far, as Dr. Merz admits, there is a parallelism. But, Dr. Merz holds, the parallel between ethics and aesthetics breaks down when the terms good and bad are changed into right and wrong, and we recognize that the contemplation of the right brings with it the sense of obligation, 'an obligation presenting itself in the form of duties which we have to perform,' whereas the contemplation of the beautiful brings with it no sense of obligation.

To those, then, who maintain that the parallelism between aesthetics and ethics holds, a dilemma is offered and their only choice is on which of its horns they will be impaled: either the sense of obligation is present in both ethics and aesthetics, or it is absent from both.

The dilemma thus presented, however, rests upon an assumption—upon the assumption that morality is based upon what is known in philosophy as a categorical imperative and in the ordinary man's language as a commandment. And the assumption seems to be of doubtful validity—doubtful, because of its self-contradictory nature. Dr. Merz, in words already quoted, rightly says that love of God and of one's neighbour is the substance and essence of Christian morality; and he also terms these exhortations to love, as most people do, commandments—'the very simple commandments of the New Testament.' But the plain and simple fact is that love cannot be commanded:



love, to be love, must be freely given. To order and command a person to love his neighbour—whether categorically, or with a threat implied—to attempt to command what can only be freely given, and so cannot be commanded, is a self-contradiction. What grammarians call ‘the imperative mood’ is so called because it is used mainly in issuing commands ; but it is an obvious mistake to imagine that it is used for no other purpose and in no other way. ‘Have mercy upon us’ is a sentence in the imperative mood, but it is not therefore a command.

Bearing this in mind, we shall have no difficulty in meeting the argument that the parallel between ethics and aesthetics breaks down. It does not break down. Love, whether it be of the Good or the Beautiful, cannot be commanded, in either case : in both cases, love, to be love, must be freely given. And in this respect the parallelism is not confined to ethics and aesthetics but extends to science as well : love cannot be commanded, it must be freely given, whether it be love of Good, Beauty or Truth.

From this point of view, then, the synoptic philosopher, seeking some hypothesis, and recognizing freely that all he hopes to attain is some hypothesis whereby things can be provisionally ordered, sees science, ethics and aesthetics as co-ordinate and parallel to one another. Anyone, therefore, who takes this point of view will, we think, find a difficulty in agreeing with the position which Dr. Merz assigns to philosophy. His view is that philosophy is ‘to occupy an intermediate position between scientific and religious thought ; its principal task being to effect a reconciliation between these two regions.’ This view of philosophy, he says, ‘forms the fundamental conception upon which the whole of this History [of European Thought in the Nineteenth Century] has been written.’

At first sight, Dr. Merz’ statement, that the position of philosophy is intermediate between scientific and religious thought, seems to leave aesthetics and ethics out of count altogether ; and, if so, to be inadequate and unsatisfactory.

We must, therefore, take into account a passage in which he says :

‘Philosophy . . . gives no new knowledge, but is merely an attempt to reconcile opinions gained . . . by the rigid methods of science on the one side and the demands of practical life on the other. . . . On the one side,’ he says, adopting Lotze’s position, ‘we have the region of facts and scientific conceptions, on the other we have an equally real world of moral, aesthetical and religious demand and belief . . . the World of Things and the World of Values.’

If we may take this passage into account, then the position occupied by philosophy in Dr. Merz’ view is intermediate between science, on the one hand, and religion, ethics and aesthetics on the other. According to the view we have put forward in the previous paragraphs, however, it is science, and not religion, which is to be co-ordinated with ethics and aesthetics, and to be classed along with them. The question arises, therefore, whether it can be maintained—as Dr. Merz, following Lotze, appears to maintain—that Value is a mark of ethics, aesthetics and religion, and absence of Value a mark of science. It cannot be maintained. Truth is what has value in science, just as goodness is what has value in morality, or Beauty in art. Science has its place in the World of Values, just as much as art or morality has a place. A World of Things, in which no value is, would be a world in which no conscious agent was to be found. The only kind of world that can be experienced, or in which a conscious agent can act, is a world the presence and value of which are felt. The conception of a world of things present to nobody and of value to none is one on which the Materialist may be left to browse.

A world of things without value is a world of abstractions. But in the world of discourse for science there is one value, *viz.* truth, just as for ethics there is one value, *viz.* the good, or, for aesthetics, the beautiful. Science, being abstract, regards the world as the region of scientific conceptions ; ethics, being abstract, regards it as the region

of ethical conceptions ; aesthetics as the region of aesthetical conceptions. The three are in this respect co-ordinate : each is, as much as either of the others, a region of conceptions ; and ethics or aesthetics is a ' region of facts,' as much as science is. But in all three cases the ' facts ' are abstractions : they are aspects of the world of reality in which we act ; and, if regarded as having independent existence, they are abstractions from the real world. It is as such—as abstractions or abstract conceptions—that philosophy, on our view, should regard them : they are the material which a synoptic philosophy has to view, with the object of framing some hypothesis, which—at any rate for the time being—may explain the complex of reality from which these conceptions have been abstracted. And the first step towards explanation consists in ordering them, in recognizing that science, ethics and aesthetics are co-ordinate.

Regarding them, then, as co-ordinate, let us consider Dr. Merz' view that philosophy is ' to occupy an intermediate position between scientific and religious thought.' First, we shall have to say that, if the position to be occupied by philosophy is intermediate, it must be intermediate between religious thought on the one side, and scientific, aesthetic and ethical thought on the other. And, next, we must ask ourselves whether the position of philosophy is to be thus intermediate. We suggest that it cannot be intermediate, if its task is, as Dr. Merz says ' to effect a reconciliation between these two regions.' And the ground for our suggestion is that one of these two regions is that of hypothesis, acknowledged to be hypothesis, while the other is the region of a faith felt not to be hypothetical.

A reconciliation between these two regions must indeed be attempted by any synoptic philosophy, that is by any philosophy which endeavours to see them together ; but a philosophy which is not dogmatic must regard both—religion equally with science—as regions of hypothesis. That is to say the position which philosophy occupies is not intermediate between the two but a point from which both can be viewed—and from which both are regarded as hypo-



thetical. In this sense—that is, in regarding both as merely hypothetical—philosophy can effect a reconciliation between the two, which is acceptable to philosophy, a reconciliation, that is to say, which consists in finding a wider hypothesis under which the two may be subsumed. But this philosophical reconciliation cannot be accepted by the religious mind as final, for it assumes what the religious mind cannot concede, *viz.* that religion is purely hypothetical. It thus appears at first sight as though philosophy and religion were essentially at variance. And this indeed is actually the case, if philosophy be regarded as dogmatically propounding its reconciliation as final. But it is not the case with a philosophy which disclaims finality and recognizes that hypothesis is not only all that philosophy achieves but all that it aims at.

But even if the task of philosophy be to reach some hypothesis, under which it is possible to subsume the assumptions which, from the point of view of philosophy, are implied in religion on the one side, and in science, ethics and aesthetics on the other—even if it be possible, in that sense, to effect a reconciliation between the two regions, it does not follow that any hypothesis you please will serve the purpose. It does not, it seems to us, follow—as it seems to Dr. Merz to follow—that religion can be co-ordinated along with ethics, aesthetics and science. Each of the three latter is abstract, in that it not only neglects the values which the two others pursue, but must neglect them, if it is to do its special work. Religion, on the other hand, neither can nor (without mutilation) does neglect either Truth, Beauty or Goodness. It is not the case that any one of the three, apart from the two others, is sought by religion: all three are held by religious faith to spring from one common source, just as there is one common impulse to seek them, *viz.* love. But whereas religion acts on this impulse and in this faith, doubting nothing, philosophy criticizes, inquiring whether this faith, which it regards as hypothesis, is one under which the assumptions of ethics, aesthetics and science can be subsumed.

Truth, beauty and goodness exist only for persons ; and between persons alone can love exist. And, also, it is by persons alone that assumptions can be made and hypotheses framed. Whether then we start from the hypotheses with which philosophy has to deal, or from the love which religion feels to be both the starting-point and the goal for all, in both cases alike personality is implied—a personality which is ‘yours’ or ‘mine’ or ‘his,’ and not merely an experience which is neither ‘yours’ nor ‘mine’ nor ‘his.’ Personality is implied, and with it love. Dr. Merz says :

‘The highest, purest, and fullest development of the principle of life, that which gives us also the only clue we possess to its intrinsic value and meaning, is to be found, for us human observers, in single specimens of the human race, in the highest examples of personality. It seems as if the vital principle has attained to a kind of finality in such instances and on the occasion of such creations. Similarly the spiritual view of things seems to recognize a kind of finality in the Christian conception of Love as the ground and the highest rule conceivable for us human beings in the Divine Order of things.’

The reader has, it must be confessed, a difficulty in understanding how Dr. Merz reconciles two lines of his argument. One line is, as we have seen, that religion, science, ethics and aesthetics are, all four of them, independent and co-ordinate growths, and that philosophy intermediates between religion on the one hand and science, ethics and aesthetics on the other hand, but passes no final opinion on them. This view ‘forms the fundamental conception upon which the whole of this History has been written.’ The other line of argument, as indicated for instance in a passage already quoted, is in effect that science and ethics, morality and truth, are not independent of the religious and spiritual view of things, but rest on it as their foundation, so that, if it be done away, they will have nothing left whereon to stand but will collapse, if religious dogma be destroyed. Here the religious and spiritual view of things seems to be presented, not as co-

ordinate with science, ethics and aesthetics, but as the basis upon which ultimately and fundamentally they must rest. Thus philosophy no longer intermediates between the religious view of the world and the scientific view, and no longer treats the two views, with equal respect, as co-ordinate; but criticizes them, and, as a result of the criticism, subordinates science, ethics and aesthetics to religion, or religious dogma. The philosopher thus provides room for a definite religious creed, but only at the cost of proving dogmatist at last—or almost dogmatist, for it is only ‘a kind of finality’ that he ‘seems to recognize’ in the highest examples of personality, and in the Christian conception of Love as the ground of the Divine Order of things.

But ‘a kind of finality’ which we ‘seem to recognize’ is not enough for religion, and it is too much for a philosophy which abstains from expressing any final opinion whatever. It is not enough for religion: religion, as felt, is a sure and certain faith which admits not of the half-doubts lurking in such phrases as ‘a *kind* of [finality]’ which we ‘*seem* to recognize.’ It is too much for any philosophy which refuses to dogmatize, even half-heartedly.

To us it seems that science, ethics and aesthetics may philosophically be regarded as not independent of the religious and spiritual view of things but as implying it; that the position of philosophy is not intermediate but a point of survey—synoptical survey—and that the only reconciliation philosophy can effect between the regions it surveys consists in hypothesis. In its survey it will find not only room, but its proper place, for religion, as an hypothesis; but, even if it should find a place for religion as the hypothesis from which all other hypotheses depend, even then, for philosophy, religion would be, if an ἀρχή, still never an ἀρχὴ ἀνυπόθετος, whereas for faith religion can never be anything but an ἀρχὴ ἀνυπόθετος.

An hypothesis is some assumption which we make to explain facts as they are known to us. To be satisfactory, an hypothesis must be such that, if it be assumed, it accounts for the facts. Dr. Merz accepts Lotze’s conception of the



two worlds, the mechanical and the spiritual. These two worlds it is the function of philosophy to see together : the ultimate hypothesis of a philosophy which is synoptic is the assumption that the unity of the two worlds, partially realized in finite personalities, is completed in the infinite Personality of the Deity. This hypothesis would, as an hypothesis, be satisfactory, if it accounted for the facts known to us.

‘ This, however,’ Dr. Merz says, ‘ is not the case. There is another difficulty to be overcome. This difficulty is the existence of Evil in the world ; comprising under the term not only the human phenomena of sin and guilt but also the widespread suffering in animated nature in which we cannot recognise the existence of any scheme of retribution.’

The existence of Evil is a fact for which the ultimate hypothesis even of a synoptic philosophy does not account ; and the difficulty which it creates is admitted by Lotze to be ultimately insoluble for the human intellect. It is to be solved, in our view, not by philosophy but by religion ; not by any hypothesis which is merely hypothesis but by faith. Faith, not philosophy, is the light which ‘ amid the encircling gloom ’ alone can lead us on. It may not enable us ‘ to see the distant scene.’ But from the arrogance of dogmatic philosophies, which profess to do so, it may humbly serve to save us.

And faith is an expression of love. In the words with which Dr. Merz concludes his *History of Thought in the Nineteenth Century* :

‘ The most comprehensive and expressive word which human language has coined to denote the fulness of personal life and activity is Love. Not only in the far-away consummation of things, but in human life as it is—

“ Love alone leads us  
Upward and on.” ’

F. B. JEVONS.

## ART. III.—WORDSWORTH AND HIS INFLUENCE.

1. *William Wordsworth, His Life, Works and Influence.*  
By GEORGE MCLEAN HARPER, Professor in Princeton University. Two volumes. (London: John Murray. 1916.)
2. *Memoirs of William Wordsworth, Poet Laureate, D.C.L.*  
By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Two volumes. (London: Moxon. 1851.)
3. *Life of Wordsworth.* By WILLIAM KNIGHT, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy, St. Andrews. Three volumes. (Edinburgh: Paterson. 1889.)
4. *Letters of the Wordsworth Family 1787-1855.* Collected and edited by WILLIAM KNIGHT. Three volumes. (Boston and London: Ginn and Co. 1907.)

## And other Works.

PROFESSOR HARPER has chosen a fortunate moment for the publication of his biography. It may be doubted if there has been any time since 1850 in which the vogue of Wordsworth has been greater than it is now. His war sonnets and other political poems have appealed to the men of to-day with unequalled force and undiminished fervour. It is characteristic of a time like the present to throw men and women back on first principles, and in Wordsworth perhaps more than any English poet who ever lived, the appeal to first principles is constant and reiterated. We hope in the following pages to give a brief notice of Wordsworth's life, followed by a few remarks on the nature of his influence.

In an exceedingly brilliant, interesting and suggestive chapter headed 'The Permanence of Wordsworth,' Professor Harper has well pointed out the qualities which gave him this ascendancy: his high aims; his intensely strong emotions; his fearless truthfulness and independence of mind; his love of nature and man; and the Ithuriel-like touch

with which pretentious shams, whether social or literary were annihilated when he came into contact with them.

As might have been expected, the first volume of this biography contains far more new matter than the second. Professor Harper is much more concerned to shew us the Wordsworth of the Eighteenth than of the Nineteenth century. Partly we think in consequence of his own Transatlantic origin, Professor Harper is chiefly attracted by Wordsworth the democrat, Wordsworth in his youth. He complains, perhaps a little unfairly, that the poet's first biographer gives but very brief notice to the years comprising and following his residence in France, and observes especially that he makes no definite allusion to an unhappy love-affair by which that sojourn in France was clouded. We are in a position to state that Dr. C. Wordsworth was in 1850 perfectly well aware of the facts ; but it is inconceivable that the poet's widow, who was then still living and in full possession of her faculties, should have allowed the reticence which Wordsworth himself had always observed to be broken almost before the aged poet was cold in his grave.

Wordsworth himself in the 'Prelude' has spoken of a time when he 'yielded up moral questions in despair.' The influence of Rousseau was then at its height, and Professor Harper has pointed out how much Wordsworth was affected by him. We can hardly forget that there were two sides to the character of that famous man: one that of a philosopher who voiced the cry of oppressed and stifled Humanity, and the other that of a mean, dissolute, shameless and selfish opportunist.

It is hardly to be wondered at that a youth of barely one and twenty, a homeless wanderer, at the most impressionable moment of early manhood should have yielded to the temptations which surrounded him ; we think, though, that his very silence (how unlike the loquacity of Goethe on *his* love-affairs) shews that he subsequently 'felt the stain like a wound.' There is little doubt that the story of 'Vaudracour and Julia' has something of an autobiographical character, as well as other passages in his



works which lack of space forbids us to particularize. He seems to have done his best to make what amends he could,<sup>1</sup> and perhaps the beautiful character of his sister Dorothy never shews in a brighter light than in the whole of her conduct in regard to what must have been to her a deeply painful incident.<sup>2</sup> Before dismissing this subject it may be allowable to express our gratitude that Wordsworth's mind was in the long run so little contaminated by all that he came in contact with in France. We may have felt that Tennyson's later praise of 'him that uttered nothing base' was rather of a chilly and negative kind; but English society perhaps hardly realizes what it owes to a poet whose ideal of womanhood is so high, and whose treatment of life is so uniformly pure. Here again we cannot but feel the influence of his sister, and, later, of his wife.

There are, after all, except for this episode, not a great many new facts to be gleaned about the period which preceded and followed Wordsworth's sudden departure from France at the end of 1792, just before the execution of Louis XVI. Professor Harper has made the most of the material at his command, and especially with regard to the men who seem to have influenced the poet's intellectual development. He tells us some additional facts about Beaupuy, the noble republican soldier, to whom Wordsworth has borne so fine a tribute in the 'Prelude'; and he acknowledges gratefully his own indebtedness to the greatest of French Wordsworthians, M. Legouis. He brings before us in succession the names of Godwin, Fawcett and their circle, which eventually included Charles Lamb and Coleridge. He goes into considerable detail about the abuses prevalent in England at the time, such as the prosecutions for 'seditious' utterances of some well-known men, *e.g.* Gilbert Wakefield, John Aikin, and, later, of Thelwall,<sup>3</sup> of the treatment of Dr. Priestley and Winterbotham. Wordsworth's earliest poetical attempts, 'An Evening Walk' and 'Descriptive Sketches,' were published by Joseph Johnson, who eventually was fined £50 and condemned to nine

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Harper, vol. i p. 142, etc.

<sup>2</sup> See vol. ii pp. 211-18.

<sup>3</sup> P. 318.

months' imprisonment for publishing an attack by Wakefield on the government.

Professor Harper gives a sketch of the life and character of Bishop Watson of Llandaff, and of Wordsworth's letter to him, which he places almost on a level with Burke's *Reflections*, so far as literary merit is concerned.<sup>1</sup> This letter was never published during Wordsworth's lifetime, but was first printed by Grosart in 1876, and copious excerpts from it have been given in Professor Knight's biography of the poet. There is not the smallest doubt that if Wordsworth was not, strictly speaking, an 'English Jacobin,' he was in 1792 closely allied with many of that number. The poem 'Guilt and Sorrow,' written in 1793-4, and partly published in 1798 under the title of the 'Female Vagrant'—Wordsworth was not specially fortunate in finding titles for his poems!—shews a great advance on its predecessors. In those, the young poet was still feeling his way to a style. Many of the passages in 'Descriptive Sketches' might have been written by Goldsmith. In 'Guilt and Sorrow' we feel we have at last got the real Wordsworth. Such a couplet as

' Homeless, near a thousand homes, I stood,  
And near a thousand tables pined, and wanted food,' †

is as Wordsworthian as anything he ever wrote. But 'Guilt and Sorrow' is also an important poem as shewing us the secret of Wordsworth's so-called 'democracy'—his deep sympathy with the poor. In his boyhood he had at his Hawkshead school realized almost to the full the sweets of that true 'Liberty, equality and fraternity' which was the dream of republican France. He tells us himself in the *Prelude* (Book ix) that the prospect opened by the French Revolution of

' The government of equal rights  
And individual worth. . . .  
Seemed nothing out of nature's certain course,  
A gift that was come rather late than soon.'

<sup>1</sup> P. 217.

But as his knowledge of life increased and he saw more of the injustice, suffering, and oppression in the world, his sympathy with the Revolution increased also—' 'Tis against that that we are fighting,' said Beaupuis<sup>1</sup> when they saw the 'hunger-bitten girl' whose thin fingers were knitting as she followed the scantily fed heifer; and it is in such a mood as this that 'Guilt and Sorrow' was written. But if we may venture on an epigram, we should say that Wordsworth's desire was not so much to put down the mighty from their seat as to exalt the humble and meek. Even in his most democratic days he felt 'many gleams of chivalrous delight' at the sight of the old castles on the Loire (*Prelude* ix). He had always a certain love of stateliness, a certain sympathy with Lord Clifford sitting 'above the board,' as well as with the shepherd boy. Few descriptions in his poetry are more charming than his picture of 'Rylstone's venerable hall' in 'The White Doe.'

In the years following his return to England, he seems to have been drifting about in London, disappointed at the turn things were taking in France, and yet quite out of sympathy with the British government. To borrow a phrase from Carlyle, this was Wordsworth's nearest approach to the 'Everlasting No.'

' Most melancholy at that time, O Friend,  
 Were my day-thoughts, my nights were miserable;  
 Through months, through years, long after the last beat  
 Of those atrocities, the hour of sleep  
 To me came rarely charged with natural gifts,  
 Such ghastly visions had I of despair,  
 And tyranny, and implements of death.

. . . . Then suddenly the scene  
 Changed, and the unbroken dream entangled me  
 In long orations, which I strove to plead  
 Before unjust tribunals—with a voice  
 Labouring, a brain confounded, and a sense,  
 Death-like, of treacherous desertion, felt  
 In the last place of refuge—my own soul.'

(*Prelude*, x.)

<sup>1</sup> So he spells the word.



In the year 1795 he received a legacy from his friend Raisley Calvert. This legacy of the modest sum of 900*l.* came as opportunely to him as the Duchess of Marlborough's more splendid benefaction of 10,000*l.* did to the elder Pitt at the crisis of his fortunes. From this time Wordsworth's life seems to take an upward turn. The 'Everlasting Yea' begins. We trace in it two great influences: that of Coleridge with his 'shaping spirit of imagination,' his philosophical power, and his warm enthusiasm; and that of Dorothy, with her unequalled gifts of perception and expression, her tender woman's heart, and her utter unselfishness.<sup>1</sup> 'Fair seed-time had my soul' was Wordsworth's phrase about his schoolboy life. Those happy intimacies, begun at Racedown, were to Wordsworth like the genial touch of spring, calling those germinating seeds to the light of day.

With the Wordsworths' settlement at Racedown in September 1795 the reader finds himself on familiar ground. It will be unnecessary to follow from this point the details of the poet's life, most of which have been long before the public; still less to criticize his writings from a literary point of view, though Mr. Harper has some excellent passages of this kind, which we should like to commend to our readers, *e.g.* the pages on the 'Evening Walk,' and the 'Descriptive Sketches,'<sup>2</sup> 'The White Doe,'<sup>3</sup> and the 'Prefaces.'<sup>4</sup> Mr. Harper makes good use of the old materials, Bishop Wordsworth's and Professor Knight's biographies, Dorothy Wordsworth's priceless *Journal*, the *Wordsworth Letters*, *The Life of Thomas Poole*, and adds here and there the fruit of his own most painstaking researches, but the main outlines of the poet's life were already pretty well fixed, and there is little additional of any first-rate importance to be recorded. Professor Harper interests us much in Sara Hutchinson; we rather wish that he could have spared a few words of praise for the beautiful sonnet 'Even so for me a vision sanctified,' which was called forth by her death.

Again he does scant justice either to the poet's brother

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the noble tribute in the *Prelude*, books xi, xii, xiv.

<sup>2</sup> Vol. i pp. 188-98.    <sup>3</sup> ii 153-8.    <sup>4</sup> i 406, 424-36; ii 252, etc.

Christopher, or to his wife, Priscilla [Lloyd]. He prints an ill-considered utterance of Coleridge, in which he refers to them in an unfriendly, contemptuous spirit (ii 174). Throughout the biography we feel that Professor Harper (probably from his dislike of 'Tories and High Churchmen') does the barest justice to Christopher Wordsworth. The latter was an enthusiastic admirer through life of his brother's poetry. 'In diction, in nature, in grace, in truth, in variety, in purity, in philosophy, in morals, in piety, does he not surpass all our writers?' was his pencilled comment in a copy of his brother's works.<sup>1</sup> He behaved with great generosity on the occasion of Dora's marriage, and probably did a good deal to make it possible.<sup>2</sup> His liberality and public spirit were notorious both at Cambridge and elsewhere. A contemporary speaks of him as 'a man whose life and wealth were spent in public aims.'<sup>3</sup> His wife, a most loving and loveable woman, died in childbirth at the age of thirty-four. We have before us a touching letter to her mother (June 21, 1812), from which a few lines may be quoted :

'Together with thy letter, the post brought an affecting one from W. Wordsworth to his brother, containing a very sad account of his wife, who has been completely overset by the sad loss of her dear little girl. I was much struck with the dignified, yet acute sensibility with which he sustained the shock ; but there is a constitutional philosophy in the whole family which is, I think, rarely to be met with. Their view of life is

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs*, ii 96.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* ii 382. A quaint story told by Dr. W. H. Thompson (Master of Trinity) reaches us from a private source. 'The poet now and then came to stay at the Lodge, which was a great treat for some of us. I remember his coming to chapel on Sunday, and Spedding inviting several of us to his rooms afterwards. Wordsworth kept us spellbound on the heights, and was brought down only at intervals to the roast mutton and currant jelly. Some time had elapsed when he said "I have left my watch upon my dressing-table, and I am afraid I must trouble one of you kindly to tell me the time, as my brother is rather particular about having prayers on Sunday, and sending the servants to bed at 10." It proved to be a quarter past 12 !'

<sup>3</sup> Churton's *Memoir of Joshua Watson*, p. 177, 2nd edition.

so dispassionate and just, that, whatever happens, they are not overthrown, or cast down with dismay.'

Wordsworth's and his sister's friendship for Charles and Mary Lamb occasioned some of Charles' most delightful letters, and we wish Professor Harper had given *in extenso* Lamb's characteristic letter on 'young William,' of which he quotes a sentence or two. Above all the friendship of Sir George and Lady Beaumont cannot be quite passed over in silence. Beaumont was something more than a generous patron: he was a stimulating, sympathizing friend and, though not an artist of first-rate power in himself, he will be remembered not only as having suggested, by a picture of Peel Castle in a storm, Wordsworth's noble 'Elegiac Stanzas' but as having by his exertions created for us our National Gallery, inducing the government to buy at the cost of £57,000 Angerstein's valuable pictures by the offer, on that condition, of his own collection as a gift to the nation.

It is not the purpose of the present article to trace the progress of Wordsworth's poetical development through various stages, already familiar to most of his readers, till it reaches its zenith in the years 1802-3, and gradually loses force till at the age of eighty there might have been some excuse for applying to him Matthew Arnold's words on 'Growing Old':

'It is—last stage of all—  
When we are frozen up within, and quite  
The phantom of ourselves,  
To hear the world applaud the hollow ghost  
Which blamed the living man.'

Certainly if any seer could have shewn Wordsworth in 1793—as in a magic glass—the Wordsworth of 1845 going to the Queen's ball in a court dress borrowed from Samuel Rogers (and we are told uncomfortably tight for him),<sup>1</sup> he might have expressed utter incredulity in tolerably vigorous language.

<sup>1</sup> Harper, ii 428.



And yet it would be unfair to call him inconsistent. Like Burke, he was only shewing another side of his nature; when, after being an ardent upholder of liberty, he appeared as a defender of law and order. It was just because Burke was Burke and Wordsworth was Wordsworth, that the one could not help shuddering at the murder of Marie Antoinette, and the other could not but feel his whole soul on fire with indignation at the tyranny and insolence of Napoleon. Of Wordsworth's great series of sonnets and other warlike poetry we shall hope to speak further on. Here perhaps we may be allowed to say a few words as to the great change in his attitude towards religion. That change was very gradual. It began with his renewed intercourse with his sister, and was doubtless accelerated by his marriage (1802).

The death of John Wordsworth in 1805 has always seemed to us to mark a great change in the poet's inner life. From that date, both in his letters and in his poetry, expressions of a religious nature become more frequent. To this period belong 'The Happy Warrior' and the 'Ode to Duty.' This change has been well pointed out by Professor Harper.

Like many other husbands and fathers, Wordsworth no doubt learnt much from his children. His own account of a conversation in the early dawn as they lay in bed with his little boy of four and a half <sup>1</sup> is as quaint as it is touching. His affection for his children was intense. When little Thomas died, he looked it was said 'ten years older.' Here again we trace a deepening sense of religion in his mind. Wordsworth was not a man who could be religious (or anything else) by halves. Like the cloud in his own poem his nature

' Moveth all together, if it move at all.'

One cannot see how a man of his high and sincere nature and warm affections could help being a Christian, any more than Michel Angelo could, when in his old age he wrote :

' Nè pinger nè scolpir fia più, che queti  
L'anima volta a quell'amor divino  
Ch'aperse a prender noi in croce le braccia.'

<sup>1</sup> See *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, ii 42.

In a certain sense his latter years were years of failing poetic power, and of that incapacity to take in new ideas or receive new impressions which is common to the vast majority of mankind, as for instance to Walter Scott, who was only roused from his apathy when visiting St. Peter's at Rome by being shewn the tomb of the Stuarts.

It is not surprising that both Wordsworth and Scott were vehemently opposed to the Reform Bills, and took the most dismal views of the future of their country. Their minds had been formed in another mould, and they were too old to change. As Professor Harper well says, in speaking of the poem of 'Michael':

'This revelation of Wordsworth's concern for the maintenance and spread of the happiness based on the ownership of small homes helps us to understand his alarm at the growth of industrialism. He saw that, under the guise of what were then called liberal ideas, powerful political forces, in alliance with business interests, were luring the rural population of England into manufacturing towns, breaking up families and home ties, turning independent workers into mill "hands," changing the face of the country, cheapening life, and diminishing happiness. This explains much in his political philosophy which later appeared to be reactionary . . . and it is perfectly in harmony with his Revolutionary zeal of former years.'<sup>1</sup>

Professor Harper seems to think of Wordsworth's strong Churchmanship as a symptom of decadence. But times had greatly changed since the days of the famous letter to Bishop Watson. A young and gracious Queen, pure in heart and pure in life, sat on the throne of her forefathers. The whole tone of the Anglican Church and of English society had gradually been elevated in the years that followed Waterloo. There was first the Evangelical and then the Tractarian movement, and—what is sometimes overlooked—a growing development of sound moderate Churchmanship antecedent to, and independent of, 'the Oxford movement.' For Wordsworth, the Church of his native land was associated with his tenderest early memories.

<sup>1</sup> Harper, vol. i chap. xvii p. 420.

He never really broke with her ; he was married in church, and his children were baptized. So far as his religious feeling could be externalized at all, it would be along those familiar lines. After all, there is something more precious than a man's intellectual gifts, and that is his spiritual life. We think one of Wordsworth's lady friends<sup>1</sup> was right, when she said (speaking of the Poet's death) 'He did the work he had to do in this world nobly. His last years were given for the good of his own soul.' In those last few years of Wordsworth's life we feel that he was quietly making ready for the life beyond. As early as 1839 he had said (in a letter to Professor H. Reed, Philadelphia<sup>2</sup>) :

' I am standing on the brink of that vast ocean I must sail so soon : I must speedily lose sight of the shore ; and I could not once have conceived how little I now am troubled by the thought of how long or short a time they who remain on that shore may have a sight of me.'

How touching, viewed in this light, are the words with which on his last Italian tour he apologizes to his wife for his hastiness and irritability of temper.<sup>3</sup> He had many failings, but he struggled with them, as he did with his utter broken-heartedness when 'Dora' died. Only four months before his death Caroline Fox wrote of him :

' The gentle, softened evening light of his spirit is very lovely and there is a quiet sublimity about him, as he waits on the shores of that Eternal World, which seems already to cast over him some sense of its beauty and its peace.'<sup>4</sup>

A few words must now be said as to those special poems of Wordsworth which appeal to us at the present moment—his grand patriotic sonnets 'dedicated to Liberty,' the 'Ode to Duty,' and 'The Happy Warrior,' to which may be added his tract on the Convention of Cintra, which has just been reprinted by Professor Dicey. In doing so we shall find it

<sup>1</sup> Miss Fenwick (Knight, *Life of Wordsworth*, vol. iii p. 490).

<sup>2</sup> *Memoirs*, chap. liv.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters of the Wordsworth Family*, iii 136.

<sup>4</sup> *Journals of Caroline Fox*, ii 152, quoted by Professor Knight.



unnecessary to discuss the poems themselves, which are among the best known and most frequently quoted of his works, but rather to consider what elements in English life and character helped to give rise to them, and what makes them specially dear to Englishmen to-day. Perhaps we shall get some light on this subject if we contrast Wordsworth with Goethe. The greatest of German poets was twenty-one years older than Wordsworth, but for sixty-two years, 1770-1832, they were contemporaries. Both were intellectual leaders in their own day, both lived to an honoured old age, and both were enormously productive as writers. But there is a strong contrast between Goethe's outwardly comfortable circumstances, his handsome person, his social acceptability, and his frank enjoyment of the good things of this life, and those of the English poet, plain, awkward, ill-dressed, and in early life certainly not a popular figure in the great world. Goethe leapt into fame with *The Sorrows of Werther* in 1774, at the age of five and twenty, and from that day forth his life was one unbroken career of literary prosperity. To Wordsworth success only came after years of struggle, long waiting, and almost penury. There was an intensity about him, a height and a depth which Goethe never reached. To quote Professor Harper once more <sup>1</sup>:

'[Wordsworth] may have been lacking in those outstanding qualities which enable some men to mix freely with persons of inferior education and humbler station. Such persons perhaps never realized that he appreciated and loved them. But to a very large extent he lived for them. We have only to think of Goethe, his purely intellectual and aesthetic interests, his careful system of self-protection, his aristocratic exclusiveness, to perceive that, in comparison with him, Wordsworth was the true philanthropist.'

The contrast between Goethe and Wordsworth is to a great extent that between Germany and England. Goethe lived in a small German principality,<sup>2</sup> where he was petted

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i ch. xvii p. 420.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Eckermann, *Conversations with Goethe*, p. 350 (1828), for some interesting remarks by Goethe on the subject.

and flattered by everyone. There was no London for the Germans of those days; no great centre of intelligence, no 'mighty heart' of a mighty nation, no House of Commons where Pitt and Fox and Burke could be heard night after night, no Westminster Abbey, no sense of being at the centre of a great national life, at the source of momentous events. Germany was at once too big and too small to foster the feelings which beat in many an English heart and found utterance on Wordsworth's lips. They had no Shakespeare, no Milton, no sense of homogeneity, no great history of naval triumphs. They had no public school and (in our sense) university life. Their religion was bald and unpicturesque. (In *Faust* Goethe has to place Gretchen in a cathedral within sound of the *Dies Irae*; and in fact to borrow from Roman Catholicism what Lutheranism was incapable of giving him.) We see at what an immense advantage Wordsworth was placed, in all these ways, by being an Englishman. But we should be mistaken if we thought his sympathies were purely insular. He was a great lover of mankind. Even in old age, he never ceased to feel the charm of France. Among his sonnets we find one on the fall of the Republic of Venice, another on Tous-saint L'Ouverture; another on the 'Negro Woman, driven from France,' others on Switzerland and Spain. Doubtless he loved England for her own sake, but he says himself:

'For dearly must we prize thee, we who find  
In thee a *bulwark for the cause of men*;  
And I by my affection was beguiled.  
What wonder, if a Poet now and then,  
Among the many movements of his mind,  
Felt for thee as a lover or a child?'

It is not the least English of Wordsworth's characteristics, that many of his sympathies were outside England, and when we think of the place this country holds to-day—how she still has to be a 'bulwark for the cause of men'—we can understand why Wordsworth appeals to the Englishmen of to-day no less than he did to their forefathers. Another feature in our English life is the large untitled

middle and upper-middle class, with those traditions of honour, culture, and good breeding which we see reflected in the best English fiction. This class is the one from which most of our influential men are drawn, the men who are the leaders in our home politics, our Indian and Colonial life, our higher clergy and professional men, and the women, often highly educated, who belong to them.

In Goethe's time, such a class could not be said to exist in Germany. Let us hear what he says of the young Englishmen of his day<sup>1</sup>:

'Whether it lies in the race, in the soil, in the free political constitution, or in the healthy tone of education—certainly, the English in general appear to have certain advantages over many others. . . . What fine, handsome people they are! And however young they come here, they feel themselves by no means strange or embarrassed in this foreign atmosphere; on the contrary, their deportment in society is as full of confidence and as easy as if they were lords everywhere, and the whole world belonged to them. . . . The secret does not lie [in being better or cleverer than other people] neither does it lie in birth or riches; it lies in the courage which they have to be that for which nature has made them. There is nothing vitiated or spoilt about them, there is nothing half-way or crooked, but such as they are, they are thoroughly complete men. That they are also sometimes complete fools I allow with all my heart, but that is still something.'

He goes on to speak of the free development of English children, and adds:

'In our own dear Weimar, I need only look out of the window to discover how matters stand with us. Lately, when the snow was lying upon the ground and my neighbours' children were trying their little sledges in the street, the police was immediately at hand, and I saw the poor little things fly as quickly as they could. . . . This has the effect with us all of taming youth prematurely, and of driving out all originality and all wildness: so that in the end nothing remains but the Philistine.'

Might not these words have been written yesterday?

<sup>1</sup> Eckermann, *op. cit.* p. 317 (Bohn's translation).



'I can, therefore I ought' was the celebrated *dictum* of Kant: and it occurs to our minds when we think how the sense of freedom in English hearts has awakened that of personal responsibility, and therefore of duty. Here we find another essentially characteristic note of Wordsworth; and another reason why his poems have proved so great a source of inspiration to the youth and manhood of England to-day. Theirs has been no automatic obedience to a mechanical law. No amount of drilling could have made English and Colonial officers (too many of them alas! the pride of our Universities and of our noblest though not always 'noble' families) respond to the call of honour as they have done, throw away lucrative employments, resign all comforts and luxuries, and not only sacrifice themselves on the altar of duty but instil a like spirit into their men. The English gentleman has made a gentleman of the common soldier.

As a matter of fact Goethe was brought closer to the realities of war than Wordsworth ever was. In his childhood French soldiers were quartered in his home. He was present at the battle of Valmy.<sup>1</sup> He had once a personal interview with Napoleon. In his *Hermann und Dorothea* he gives a vivid picture of the sufferings of exiled fugitives. But the real interests of his life lay elsewhere, in literary criticism, in dramatic representation, in art, and above all in scientific research. He could never have said as Wordsworth did 'that he had given twelve hours' thought to the condition and the prospects of society, for one to poetry.'<sup>2</sup> How characteristic these two attitudes are of the German and the Englishman respectively! What a keen *political* sense there is in both Shakespeare and Milton!

Another point which unites Wordsworth to our own day is his deep sense of the moral regeneration needed in our own country. The grand sonnet, 'Milton, thou should'st

<sup>1</sup> See Sir E. Creasy's *Fifteen Decisive Battles of the World*. The description of Valmy has a peculiar interest, now that we are fighting once more on the same ground.

<sup>2</sup> Knight, *Life of Wordsworth*, iii 238.

be living at this hour,' illustrates this feeling, and so does another, also dated London 1802.

'O friend, I know not which way I must look  
For comfort, being, as I am, opprest,  
To think that now our life is only drest  
For show : mean handywork of craftsman, cook,  
Or groom ! We must run glittering like a brook  
In the open sunshine, or we are unblest :  
The wealthiest man among us is the best ;  
No grandeur now in Nature or in book  
Delights us. Rapine, avarice, expense,  
This is idolatry ; and these we adore ;  
Plain living and high thinking are no more ;  
The homely beauty of the good old cause  
Is gone ; our peace, our fearful innocence,  
And pure religion breathing household laws.'

Might not these lines have been applied, with even greater force and appropriateness, to at least some sections of English society in 1912-13 ?

In one respect it must be owned that Goethe was more like the average German than Wordsworth was like the average Englishman, for though Goethe was extremely witty and satirical, he had little or no humour, while Wordsworth had absolutely none. Perhaps in this he resembled Milton, whose efforts to be jocose are lamentable failures. Both these great English poets (like Dante) were so intensely, terribly in earnest that it is inconceivable that they should ever have played with their subject. For this reason they appeal like the Hebrew prophets most strongly to human nature when stirred to its depths by some overwhelming emotion. Wordsworth in his old age told a story heard from Sir George Beaumont, that

' while Garrick was venting, as Lear, the violent paroxysms of rage in the awful tempest scene, his wig happened to fall off. The accident did not produce the slightest effect on the gravity of the house, so strongly had he impregnated every breast with his own emotions.' <sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Memoirs of William Wordsworth*, ii 471.

It is this intensity of spirit, this profundity and yet simplicity of feeling that makes Wordsworth so real to us at this most critical hour of our national life. We are constantly feeling that the utterances of the early Nineteenth century express what is passing in our minds and hearts to-day. May we conclude with a sonnet which is as appropriate to us now as it was to our forefathers a century ago?

*October 1803.*

‘When, looking on the present face of things,  
I see one man, of men the meanest too !  
Raised up to sway the world, to do, undo,  
With mighty nations for his underlings,  
The great events with which old story rings  
Seem vain and hollow ; I find nothing great :  
Nothing is left which I can venerate ;  
So that at last a doubt within me springs  
Of Providence, such emptiness at length  
Seems at the heart of all things. But, great God !  
I measure back the steps which I have trod,  
And tremble, seeing whence proceeds the strength  
Of such poor Instruments. With thoughts sublime  
I tremble at the sorrow of the time.’

A word of praise must be added for the illustrations in Professor Harper’s book. We are especially grateful to him for the fine Pickersgill sketch and for the beautiful meditative head reproduced from Haydon’s picture of ‘Christ’s Entry into Jerusalem.’ One wishes the portrait, said to be of Keats in the same picture, were equally worthy of the original.

E. WORDSWORTH.

---

#### ART. IV.—THE ENGLISH RITE.

1. *The English Rite, being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer.* With an Introduction and an Appendix. By F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A., D.D. etc. Two vols. (London: Rivingtons. 1915.)

2. *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*. Edited from British Museum MS. Royal, 7. B. IV, with Introduction, Appendix, Notes and Indices by J. WICKHAM LEGG. 'Henry Bradshaw Society' Publications, Vol. L. (London: Printed for the Society by Harrison and Sons. 1915.)

THE English Rite after two and a half centuries has acquired a position of its own, which is aptly symbolized by Dr. Brightman's two massive volumes. With their help it is more easy now than ever before to appreciate what there is that is common, and what there is that is individual, in its composition. Other books belonging to previous generations had set forth, in one form or another, the gradual processes by which that Rite attained its present form. But none previously had shewn, at the same time, with at all the same completeness or clearness, what the different stages in the Rite, from 1549 onwards, owed to already existing sources.

The borrowings in 1549 and 1550 are very extensive, and the influences that have told on the compilation of these books are very varied. Incomparably greatest among the sources is the series of Latin Service Books, which were being superseded by the new rite. But this does not represent the whole influence from what we may call the conservative side. The spirit of conservative reform exercises an influence through the familiar work of Quignon in his *New Roman Breviary*,<sup>1</sup> as also in the less familiar work of the Chapter of Cologne, the *Antididagma*, which represents the protest of the clergy against the more radical proposals of their Archbishop, Hermann von Wied, in his *Consultation*.<sup>2</sup>

The Lutheran influence is considerable; and Dr. Brightman, besides estimating it cautiously and fairly, also points out that it comes mainly from the most conservative of the three classes into which the early Lutheran liturgical books fall.<sup>3</sup> No influence from Zürich or Geneva has any

<sup>1</sup> Brightman, *The English Rite*, xxvi ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* xxviii, xlv-xlix.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* xxxviii, lxxx.



effect on the Prayer Book, unless it be the case either that the opening provided for Divine Service in 1552 was suggested by the rites which Pullain and Laski printed in 1551, or that the insertion of the Decalogue with the *Kyries* was due to such precedents. Dr. Brightman seems more inclined to recognize it in the former place than in the latter. For he shews clearly that the use of the Commandments at Mass is a remains of the ancient vernacular devotion said then from the pulpit, and that their association with the *Kyrie* was ancient in Germany and perpetuated by Luther.<sup>1</sup>

The influence of the Mozarabic rite on the baptismal service is one of the many puzzles concerning the genesis of the Book of 1549: Dr. Brightman duly sets it forth but throws no new light upon it. The influence of Eastern rites is small, but some of it is clear. The Prayer of St. Chrysostom is shewn to come not directly from an Eastern liturgical book, but from the print of the Liturgy in the works of St. Chrysostom published at Venice in 1528, and from the Latin translation rather than from the Greek.<sup>2</sup> A similar case of the use of this Latin translation seems also to appear in the Litany.<sup>3</sup> The source of passages which are parallel to the Liturgy of St. Basil is not so clear, and indeed this influence is not very certain in any of the places where it may be suspected, *viz.* the Litany, the Consecration Prayer, and the Prayer of Humble Access.

Patristic and scholastic writers have contributed their share of influence. For example Dr. Brightman notes a reminiscence of Florus of Lyons in 'Dearly beloved': he quotes Aquinas as giving the teaching with regard to the effect of the two Kinds upon body and soul respectively, which is a familiar feature of the Prayer of Humble Access, and the teaching concerning the local presence of Christ, which is found in the 'Black Rubric.' St. Basil's treatise on Baptism has influenced the exhortation to Godparents.

<sup>1</sup> Brightman, *The English Rite*, cxlvi ff.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* lxviii, lxvi.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* lxviii. The English translator has mistranslated *convenientibus* (gathered together) which is the word given as the equivalent of *συνφωνοῦσιν* in the prayer and in St. Matt. xviii 19.

More familiar is the passage in St. Augustine which defines the value of spiritual communion, and is followed in the Visitation Office.

Again the Canon law lies behind many of the rubrics, and interesting references to Gratian, Lyndwood and the like shew the points of connexion.

Thus old liturgical tradition and contemporary external influences have had a marked share in determining the character of the English Rite ; but nevertheless it has a character which is all its own. This it is that has given it the right to persist, and win a place as a recognized liturgical type, or rather as a family, whose members, though not by any means all English in nationality, all alike have English as their original tongue.

The leading characteristics of the English Rite have often been pointed out. But however clearly they have been indicated, this has not obviated the rise of a bad habit of patching and piecing and supplementing of this rite with much incongruous material. It is therefore necessary still to insist upon the point, and to notice the process of assimilation and digestion which made the English Rite not a patchwork but a type. Cranmer had, as Dr. Brightman has said, an absorbent mind ; but the mind or minds that framed the first English Book were assimilative also. The Litany, which we especially recognize as Cranmer's work, drew its inspiration from many sources ; but no process of higher criticism could ever have successfully distinguished them, if the sources themselves had perished. The Latin and the German elements are fused, the proportion of the constituent parts is altered, and the grouping of petitions is changed, perhaps not for the better ; but what emerges is a shapely and homogeneous form of prayer, adapted to the new circumstances, although so largely dependent upon the old. The English Rite has begun to come into being.

Take as a further instance the new Canon of 1549. It is a document that is open to a good deal of criticism from various points of view. But let anyone read through first of all the odd series of elements that are clumsily

patched together to form the very venerable Latin Canon, and then compare with it the progressive order and flowing consistency of the English substitute, calling to mind at the same time that the latter is to some extent indebted also to other influences—the Eastern Liturgies and the *Antididagma*, besides contemporary English documents; he will then perforce see that the English Canon is a most creditable attempt at a Liturgy of a new type. The pity is that it was so soon to be dismembered and broken up into a set of fragments which preserve in isolation very little of the consistency of the whole.

The literary language of the English Rite has also contributed to its distinctiveness. Notwithstanding the variety of the sources, the language assures a unity to the rite throughout. In some respects it has done this too successfully: the Latin Collects, for example, have often lost greatly by being represented in that form of Tudor English which we may rightly call 'Prayer-Book English.' The fashionable literary habit of the day, which loved to express one idea by two parallel and synonymous words, has often played havoc with the terseness of the originals. The assimilation of these venerable epigrams to the prevalent style of the rite has been almost too well done. The literary skill of the rite has the defects of its qualities.

Two opposite dangers therefore beset us in the rehandling of the traditional English Rite by any reforming hand. The one is the introduction of discordant or unassimilated elements, and especially the putting of an old patch upon a relatively new garment. In the present position of things, so far as the Holy Eucharist is concerned, this expedient has become a common habit and a growing one. It will continue to grow, until some better expedient is devised for supplementing the deficiencies of the present rite. The only way in which to deal with the habit of supplementing the English mutilated Order by the importation of parts of the Latin Canon is to provide an adequate English Canon. When that is done the patching will cease, because there will be neither desire for it nor room for it any longer. Meanwhile the habit continues: and there is

some danger also in the future lest a revised Canon on more adequate lines may itself be merely a piece of patch-work like the crude anticipations of it that are at present in vogue.

The danger on the other side comes from those who are so greatly impressed with the homogeneity of the English Rite, so far as language is concerned, that they are intolerant of any approach to modern English or the mother-tongue. They are (perhaps unconsciously) the historical successors of those who pleaded for the retention of the Latin tongue and against the adoption of the mother-tongue : like them they prefer the archaic to the actual. Now no one will deny that there is, in English, as in some other tongues, a liturgical language which should be employed in corporate worship. The Prayer Book has created this. But it is not the same thing as Tudor English. Later epochs have contributed to it ; and there is no reason why the Twentieth century should not have a worthy contribution to make to it. Nor is there any reason why archaisms should be preserved where the meaning can equally well be expressed in intelligible and current but yet liturgical English. Further there are some portions of rites, such as the promises of Godparents or the vows of marriage, where in order to obtain the absolute vernacular it would be legitimate and according to the best precedent even to desert the liturgical language, and come frankly to the talk of the people. To do so would not in any real sense lower the dignity of the whole, nor spoil the homogeneous character of the rite.

Dr. Brightman's synopsis puts before us the English Rite at three stages in its history, set in three separate parallel columns ; while other intervening stages are skilfully indicated by type and index numbers. The open page seems to challenge us with the question ' Which of these is the best form of the English Rite, that should serve as the basis for the Prayer Book of the future ? ' Our first instinctive answer is, that of course we shall start from the latest of the stages—the existing Book of 1661. In a sense, that is inevitably true. The next Book will be



the successor of the last Book. But this synopsis shews also the necessity of going behind it ; and indeed urges us to answer, on second thoughts, that perhaps we might do better to take the Book of 1549 as the basis. In fact many an amateur Prayer-Book reformer in sketching out his own plans for revision must often have found himself unconsciously and not of express purpose moving in the direction of a reversion to features of 1549.

In doing so he is doing nothing unprecedented. The same tendency has revealed itself in earlier stages of reform. There seems to have been some real move in 1558 to take the Book of 1549 rather than that of 1552 as the basis for the new Book. Whether the Queen herself shared this view, as is sometimes said, we do not know. At any rate the desire was not fulfilled at that point.

It was otherwise, however, when the time came for the drawing up of the Scottish Book of 1637 ; the Scottish Church has benefited by the fact ever since, and the American Church likewise. In 1661 the circumstances were not favourable for the following of that precedent ; but now, in the more favourable circumstances of to-day, the precedent might well be followed. The daily Morning and Evening Prayer had better return to being, what it was in structure in 1549, an office opening with the Versicles and closing with the third collect, leaving a penitential prelude or an intercessory postlude to be added at discretion or on specified occasions. In the Holy Eucharist the lines of the Canon of 1549 afford the best basis of the reconstruction of our Liturgy, though some of the modifications, even of structure, that have come in since might wisely be preserved. In the Baptismal Office, and still more markedly in the Burial Service, the line of wise reform is largely the line of the First Prayer Book.

If therefore in this way there is so much to be gained from 1549 in the case of the above offices—the most important in the Book—is it not time that we contemplated a revision which boldly took the First Prayer Book rather than any subsequent one as its basis ? As we read the parallel columns of *The English Rite*, looking forward and

not backward, this is the conclusion towards which we seem to be almost inevitably forced.

If this conclusion emerges from a general consideration of the question, it may be well to go further into detail, and notice in turn some points where the earlier book is preferable.

The English form of the Divine Office is one of the triumphs of the compilers. It is the result of a combination of conservatism, as regards the main purposes of the Divine Office, and of radical changes in all the details. But the changes, however radical, produced a practical scheme, which has persisted and been almost too successful in attracting to itself the devotion of the laity as well as of the clergy. It is possible to trace some stages in the radical reform. Quignon's Breviary led the way ; and in the two drafts of a revised office which we now have before us, published in full for the Henry Bradshaw Society, there is interesting evidence of further stages in the transformation as they formed themselves in the mind of Cranmer. The new edition does not add much to what was already known through the partial publication of the MS in the book of Cardinal Gasquet and Mr. Edmund Bishop.<sup>1</sup> It is satisfactory however to have now the whole, set out at full length, and available for study. It still remains difficult to ascertain exactly the relation of the two drafts one to another and the stages which they represent of Cranmer's progress towards the Prayer Book. The one has only two Hours of Prayer, while the other retains the ancient number of seven (or eight). The former has also provision for the use of the vernacular for the Lord's Prayer and the Lessons, which the latter has not. The former therefore lies the nearer in scheme to the Book of 1549, but it is not certain that it is the nearer in date. The latter may represent a reaction in Cranmer's mind and plans, analogous to the reaction which characterized the closing period of Henry's reign. But we are now chiefly concerned to note that all that great transformation, which really was the making of

<sup>1</sup> *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer* (1890), pp. 309-394.

the new English Divine Service, is complete in the Book of 1549. The Second Book is only responsible for some further changes much less considerable in size and less unquestionable in value. The ponderous opening provided in 1552 has had its day and is now generally recognized to be quite disproportionate and unsuitable for use twice a day. In a reduced form it may be very valuable especially at Evensong, or at Mattins too on some special occasions or when the Holy Eucharist does not follow : but it will be better regarded as an optional prelude to the Office than as an integral part of it.

Both the drafts begin the Office with the Lord's Prayer, and the former directs it to be said in English and more distinctly than had been the custom. We see in these directions the approach to the bad custom, which has been retained ever since 1549, of beginning aloud before the Versicle *O Lord, open thou our lips* has been said (a practice which is in itself an anomaly), and of beginning with the Prayer which ought to be reserved to form a climax at a later point. Thenceforward there is much in the Book of 1549 which is preferable. It does well to provide an alternative to *Te Deum* for Lent (though the *Benedicite* is not itself a good alternative) and to provide no mere psalms as alternatives for *Benedictus*, *Magnificat* or *Nunc dimittis*. Its direction that the Creed should be said is better than the later provision that it should be 'sung or said' ; but its direction as to the time of saying it has been wisely superseded by the transference of the Creed to the present position, effected in 1552. It rightly directs the priest to stand at the saying of the collects—an order which was subsequently obscured. It rightly prescribes the *Quicumque*, making it an addition and not a substitute, as in 1661. It wisely ends the Office at the third collect, leaving anything further to be treated as a supplement or as a separate service.

We shall find a good many similar reasons for preferring the Order of 1549 in other services also. The provision of some psalmody for the Eucharist is valuable, and though the series of Introits provided was not an attractive one;

it was a pity that the provision was not improved but abolished. As the service continues, we may notice (apart from the great central question of the Canon and its relation to the group of prayers for the communicants, provided in 1548) certain other points where the First Book is preferable. The brief preparation, consisting only of the Lord's Prayer (again misplaced) and the Collect for Purity, is to be said 'afore the middes of the Altar,' *i.e.* as part of the approach to the altar. The clerks meanwhile sing the Introit. The simple *Kyries* which follow are much preferable for constant use to the *Kyries* farsed by the Ten Commandments. The insertion of the Decalogue in 1552 is one of the signs that the compilers had given up by then the fine ideal, with which they had started, of frequent and daily communion, and had dropped down to a lower level. Now that we are returning to realize the higher ideal, we return naturally towards the earlier form of Liturgy; and we find in particular the daily recitation of the Decalogue unprofitable and burdensome.

When the *Kyries* are over, the priest has reached 'God's Board' to begin the *Gloria in Excelsis*. It is difficult to decide whether this position for it is the better, or the present position at the end of the service. The Latin precedent favours the earlier position, but this has been followed by no Anglican Liturgy since 1549. The Latin precedent has more to be said for it as regards tradition than as regards *rationale*. The *Gloria* was originally prefixed only to the Mass on Christmas night, where its function was to strike the first note of Christmas by its connexion with the song of the angels at the Nativity. There was more justification for its taking this position on that single occasion than there is on the other occasions to which it has been extended. Moreover, when placed as a thanksgiving at the end of the Liturgy in 1552, it became not an occasional but a permanent element in the service, which it had never been previously. All this detracts very considerably from the force of the precedent; and tends to shew that the transposition to a new place and a new function was a wise one.

No doubt it may be the case that wisdom might dic-



tate the omission of both Creed and *Gloria* on week-days, according to the Book of 1549 following Latin precedent, now that we no longer, as in 1552, provide for the Liturgy to be celebrated merely on Sundays and Festivals : and this might tell in favour of a restoration to the earlier position. But it is further to be remembered that the English Rite has enlarged the expression of thankfulness and praise at the end of the service beyond what is customary in the Latin Rite : and it is not likely to go back from that policy. From the point of view of the communicant, it may be true that anything after Communion is of the nature of an anticlimax. Dr. Brightman regards the Blessing in that light.<sup>1</sup> It was probably in favour of the faithful who were not then communicating that the custom arose of giving a blessing at the end of Mass : but these are people who have also a right to be considered, besides those who are communicating ; and for them it is a distinct gain to have the *Gloria* to sing at the end of the service and in presence of the Blessed Sacrament.

It is difficult to guess why the *Dominus vobiscum* was omitted in 1552 before the collect, or to justify the change : and the same is true of its omission at the beginning of the Canon, and before the Thanksgiving. The transference in 1552 of the Memorial for the King to a place before the collect of the day is, as Dr. Brightman says, 'unhappy,' while the over-scrupulous phrase of 1661, 'The Portion of Scripture etc.,' is equally truly described as 'ugly.' To say 'The Lesson' would be much preferable—if Puritan meticulousness is still to be humoured.

The publication of banns and other notices was not regulated by the Book of 1549. After the Creed the Sermon followed, the Exhortation to Communion, and the Offertory. In 1552 such notices were prescribed, contrary to usual custom, after the Sermon ; and in 1661 they were rightly ordered to be before the Sermon. The Bidding of Bedes is one of such notices ; and hence we have retained the tradition of the 'Bidding Prayer' before the Sermon.

<sup>1</sup> *English Rite*, p. cxi.

Recently, however, some confusion has been caused by orders directing the bidding of war prayers to take place before the Church Militant Prayer, *i.e.* at a point which is contrary to precedent and rubric, and also has the disadvantage of allowing no time in which the congregation can do as it is bid. Dr. Brightman's very full Appendix on the Bidding of the Bedes<sup>1</sup> will, we may hope, have the effect of saving us from this mistake in the future, as well as of encouraging a more free and intelligent use of this great opportunity and this scheme of free prayer incorporated within the Holy Eucharist itself.

We reach a new point of contrast between the Book of 1549 and the later books in the rubric '*. . . then shall the Priest or Deacon turn him to the people and say Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church.*' There is no gain in the omission of the words *or Deacon*. There was undoubtedly a distinct purpose in the addition of the words '*militant here in earth,*' for which Dr. Brightman cites a precedent from a Sarum Primer.<sup>2</sup> It emphasized the almost complete omission of prayer for the departed, and on that ground it was a bone of contention during the revision of 1661. At the present time the prejudices against sober liturgical prayer for the faithful departed, which necessitated such an omission, have almost completely vanished: and therefore this also is a point at which 1549 gives the better precedent.

It would be impossible in a short survey of the points of difference, such as we are now attempting, to discuss the great problem of the Canon itself and its relation to the penitential part of the service; but it is possible, just in passing, to recall that the two Anglican rites which in the main have followed the Liturgy of 1549 have diverged one from another in the matter of the Intercession: the Scottish Books have kept it as part of the Canon, while the American Book has conformed to the English custom, adopted in 1552,

<sup>1</sup> *English Rite*, pp. 1020-1045.

<sup>2</sup> It is also in an earlier Primer of 1511, and with the addition of the word '*holy*' before '*church*' according to Hoskins, *Primers*, p. 126.

of setting the Intercession in its primitive position before the Canon.

A small point with regard to the penitential section may also be noted in passing. The Confession has been said by all the people only since 1661; it was previously said by one person in the name of all those communicating. It may be a gain that all of them should say it, and perhaps also that in saying it they should be led by one of the ministers. But it is a pity that the distinction between those who are communicating and those who are not should be obliterated, as is practically the case in consequence of the clumsy wording of the rubric of 1661. A similar clumsiness in the rubric preceding 'Therefore with angels etc.' brought about another confusion through which it was long customary for the congregation to join in at that point instead of at the *Sanctus*. The custom has now almost vanished; but the rubric in 1661 which attempted to define what had previously been left for tradition to decide, still remains ambiguous and misleading.

In regard to the *Agnus Dei* and the words of administration, a return to the Book of 1549 is already very largely admitted to be desirable. The provision of (Post-)communions<sup>1</sup> to be sung after Communion is a matter which hangs together with that of Introits, Graduals and Offertories. The traditional series of incidental choir music was retained in the Book of 1549 with only one item excluded, *viz.* the Gradual. This exclusion was unfortunate, for the Gradual is probably the oldest of the series and comes at the most practical place that there is for choir psalmody in the Eucharist. The First Book made full but unsatisfactory provision for Introits, and queer mistaken provision for Offertories and (Post)communions. The first and last disappeared in 1552, leaving only the Offertory sentences surviving. It is not clear what is the best line to follow in the future with regard to this group. It may well be maintained that these four points in the service provide valuable opportunities for

<sup>1</sup> It will be remembered that the Latin *postcommunio* is a collect, while the music sung is called *communio*.

some music, designed to be sung by the choir, when there is one, as distinct from the music of the *Kyrie*, *Creed*, *Sanctus*, *Agnus*, and *Gloria*, which belongs by right to the people. Again it may be recognized that the present Offertory sentences are unsuitable, because they deal almost entirely with the collection of money for the poor, and not with the Offertory itself. But it is not easy to see what to substitute, nor even on what plan to form a series of texts for these occasions. The old Latin series has a strong claim to survival wherever its old music can be retained : but we have few choirs capable of singing the elaborate ancient music ; and, divorced from the music, the series forfeits a great part of its claim and *raison d'être*. Perhaps what would best satisfy present conditions would be a series of brief texts, drawn mainly from the Psalms, authorized for optional use at these four points in the service, or, better still, at the first three points, and during the Communion rather than after it. Those verses that are chosen for the Introit and Communion might well be associated with the *Gloria patri*, and the others not, so as to preserve a difference in treatment which has its roots in antiquity. Thus in time a series of settings, motets or anthems might grow up for the use of the choir ; or the texts might even be sung to ordinary chants, failing anything better.

The project of return to the model of the Liturgy of 1549 raises one further question of interest. The rubric then ordered that on Wednesdays and Fridays the Litany should be said or sung : and that after it, if there was no Communion, the priest in a cope should say the Ante-communion Service. The revival of such an order is well worth consideration ; it would be the recovery of an observance of the old Station Days with a service not unlike that which formerly accompanied them. It might also help to recover in time those days as days of Communion in places where there is not so far a daily Eucharist.

In the Baptismal Service the main advantage to be gained by following the Book of 1549 is the recovery of the distinction between the Admission as catechumen and the Administration of Baptism. The advantage is even greater



from the point of view of the Mission field than from that of the parish at home. Even in the latter it would be a gain to have the early part of the service said at the church door, to have the crossing recognizable as the admission to the catechumenate and not as an 'obvious anticlimax' which, as Dr. Brightman truly says, is the case in its present position. The recovery of the exorcism in some form or another might be desirable in the Mission field, but is probably less to be advocated at home. Again the restoration of the Lord's Prayer and Creed to their old place as characteristic of the making of a catechumen is preferable in any sphere where the catechumenate is a practical reality. But such things concern the office of Adult Baptism rather than the Baptism of Infants—there was no such office in the Book of 1549—and possibly the needs of the heathen in the Mission field are better to be met by the provision of an entirely new office of Adult Baptism than by any modification of the service intended for infants which might be dictated solely in their interest. Such a new office would naturally go back to the primitive models direct, and be framed according to the originals and not according to the secondary derivatives (either Latin or English) which have been made for infants.

The First Book provides a much better form for the hallowing of the font: and it is a great pity that it was ever cut down in deference to Bucer. More indefensible still is the omission in 1552 of the provision for trine immersion. Bucer is not responsible for that; but he probably is for the contemporary omission of the chrysom and the unction. On the whole it is not too much to say, that a skilful adaptation of very complex and redundant sources provided a fine and homogeneous baptismal office of a simpler and more manageable kind in 1549, which was mangled in 1552, and has remained in its mangled condition ever since.

The same is the case with the funeral service. No one can read the account<sup>1</sup> that Dr. Brightman gives of what he

<sup>1</sup> *English Rite*, pp. cxxvi ff]; cliv, clxiv.

rightly calls 'the ruin of the Order for the Burial of the Dead' without realizing this. That order comprised in 1549 the four essential elements that underlay the complex series of Latin formulae, set in a logical sequence and expressed in English with great brevity and simplicity:— (i) the procession; (ii) the placing of the body in the grave and casting of earth thereon by the priest, with appropriate devotions; (iii) a short 'office of the dead' said in church either before or after (ii), consisting of psalms, lesson, suffrages and collect; (iv) the celebration of the Holy Communion, with special introit, collect, epistle and gospel. In 1661 the psalms and lesson were interposed between (i) and (ii). Then after the burial (which was deprived of two of its prayers in 1552) came the rest of the 'office of the dead,' deprived, as in 1552, of some of its versicles. Finally (iv) the funeral mass since 1552 was represented only by its collect, transferred to the end of the order of burial: while in 1661 the revisers, taking pity on its forlorn position, tried to mend matters by adding after it *The Grace*, to serve as a conclusion to the office. The result is an unfortunate and unsuitable chaos, which can best be amended by a return to the lines of 1549.

It would demand too much space to carry on this comparison to other offices: these four instances must suffice, being quite enough to shew that there is a strong case for taking the First Book as the basis of future revision. The work that has been done by the Convocations so far has been only preliminary, and it has, in many respects, failed to grapple with the things that really matter. It may be a useful contribution to later stages: but in itself it is fundamentally inadequate, and starts from the wrong starting-point.

As a further contribution to future stages of revision it may be useful to call attention to some details, small but important, which emerge from Dr. Brightman's pages. There are in the Prayer Book some capital errors in translation which need to be revised, or at least reconsidered. The following may be taken as specimens. The *Gloria patri*<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *English Rite*, p. lxvii.

in its Latin form has an inserted phrase ' sicut in principio ' which forms a parenthesis : a better translation would therefore be ' As it was in the beginning, so now and ever : world without end. Amen.' The word ' health ' in the Confession should be altered to ' salvation '—' and there is no salvation in us.'<sup>1</sup> In the Prayer of St. Chrysostom the word *συμφωνοῦσιν* or *convenientibus* should be rendered by the word ' agree '—' that when two or three agree in Thy Name.' Again in the Liturgy it is important to restore at the end of the Creed the omitted adjective *sanctam*—' And I believe One Holy Catholick and Apostolick Church.'<sup>2</sup> The Preface should be altered so as to run ' O Holy Lord, Father Almighty, Everlasting God,' so that each title retains its own proper epithet.

The *Gloria in Excelsis* presents a more difficult problem, because there are important differences of text between the Greek original and the Latin version which has found its way into the Liturgy. Another Latin version, which, like the Greek original, was used in the non-Roman or Gallican Morning Service, and not in the Liturgy, followed more closely the Greek form : but this is in collateral line, not in direct sequence, with the Hymn as we have it in the Eucharist. The question arises, Which form should be followed? Our version fairly represents the Latin Mass-form except for two points to be mentioned hereafter. The first part is addressed to God the Father : the second to God the Son ; while a mention of the Holy Spirit is made at the close. In the Greek form, as exhibited from the earliest authority, the Alexandrine Codex of the Bible,<sup>3</sup> down to the present Greek service books, the mention of the Holy Spirit is made earlier, so as to form, in conjunction with the opening phrases of what is otherwise the second part addressed to God the Son, a commemoration of the Holy Trinity, closing the first part : while what remains as the second part is

<sup>1</sup> *English Rite*, p. clix.

<sup>2</sup> The question of the *Filioque* is too large to be touched in a brief catalogue of specimens such as this.

<sup>3</sup> Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*, iii 832.

wholly addressed to God the Son, except for the mention of God the Father at the end.

‘ . . . God the Father Almighty, O Lord the Only-begotten Son Jesu Christ and the Holy Ghost.  
O Lord God Lamb of God. . . . Thou only art the Lord, Jesus Christ in (εἰς) the glory of God the Father. Amen.’

The Irish in utilizing this text (for the most part) made two prayers of it, adding at the end of the first section an Amen, thus :

‘ . . . Deus Pater omnipotens, Domine Fili unigenite Iesu Christe, Sancte Spiritus dei ; et omnes dicimus, Amen.’<sup>1</sup>

The probability is that there was originally no mention of the Holy Spirit ; but subsequently the defect was felt, and was remedied in two different ways.

In the Scottish Liturgy since 1764 the difficulty has been met by a policy of inclusion. Both mentions are included ; and moreover the phrase Κύριε Ὅτις μονογενὲς Ἰησοῦ Χριστέ, is repeated so as to do duty in both parts. This is perhaps the worst solution, though it has some support from ancient Celtic sources.<sup>2</sup>

‘ . . . God the Father Almighty ; and to thee, O God, the only-begotten Son Jesu Christ ; and to thee, O God, the Holy Ghost.

‘ O Lord, the Only-begotten Son . . . ’

If we are right in thinking that neither form exactly represents the original, then we shall feel more justified in keeping to the Latin tradition as we have received it.

But in two places some amendment of our present version of the Latin is needed. ‘ On high ’ is not an adequate translation of *in excelsis*, nor does it correspond with the English version of the biblical passage from which the phrase comes. The Scottish Office of 1764 was wise in

<sup>1</sup> *Antiph. Bangor*, I (H.B.S.), f. 33r.

<sup>2</sup> The Bangor Antiphonary (*ut s.*) for example has the double mention ; but this is not unnatural if the *Gloria* is treated as two formulas not one.



beginning ' Glory be to God in the highest.' Again no adequate justification has been found for the reduplication of the phrase ' Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us,' which was introduced in 1552. The same edition of the Scottish Office was wise in ejecting it,<sup>1</sup> and we should be wise to follow its example in both these points.

Here we must close our discussion of these few points arising out of the perusal of Dr. Brightman's pages. It has given so far but a very little idea of the wealth of material, information, and sound judgement, that is to be found in them : but it has shewn, we may hope, that his book is not merely of immense value to the student of the English Rite, but even indispensable.

W. H. FRERE.

---

#### ART. V.—CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

1. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. Herausgegeben von Dr. OTTO STÄHLIN. Three volumes. (Leipzig : Hinrichs. 1905-9.)
2. *Clement of Alexandria*. By JOHN PATRICK, D.D. (Edinburgh : W. Blackwood and Sons. 1914.)
3. *Clement of Alexandria*. By R. B. TOLLINTON, B.D. Two volumes. (London : Williams and Norgate. 1914.)
4. *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*. By C. BIGG, D.D. (Bampton Lectures for 1886.) Reprinted, with some additions and corrections by F. E. BRIGHTMAN. (Oxford : Clarendon Press. 1913.)
5. *Symbola ad Clementis Alexandrini Stromatum librum VIII interpretandum*. Scripsit CHRISTIANA DE WEDEL. (Berlin. 1905.)
6. *De Clementis Alexandrini Stromatum libro VIII qui fertur*. Scripsit W. ERNST. (Göttingen. 1910.)

<sup>1</sup> It perhaps was not so wise however in substituting the word ' who ' for ' that ' at the first *qui tollis*.

7. *Die Quellen des Clemens Alexandrinus.* Von JOHANNES GABRIELSSON. In two Parts. (Upsala. 1906-1909.)
8. *Die Psychologie des Clemens von Alexandrien in Verhältnis zu seiner Ethik.* Von GERRIT VERKUYL, M.A., B.D. (Leipzig. 1906.)
9. *Klemens von Alexandrien und seine Erkenntnisprinzipien.* Von Dr. W. SCHERER. (Munich. 1907.)
10. *Die eklektischen Anschauungen des Clemens von Alexandria und seine Abhängigkeit von der griechischen Philosophie.* Von MARKOS J. DASKALAKIS. (Leipzig. 1908.)
11. *Der Optativgebrauch bei Clemens von Alexandrien.* Von Dr. JAKOB SCHAM. (Paderborn. 1913.)
12. *Selections from the Writings of Clement of Alexandria* [in translation]. By RUFUS M. JONES. 'Religion of Life' Series. (London: Headley Brothers.)
13. *Extracts from the Writings of Clement of Alexandria* [translated]. (London and Benares: Theosophical Publishing Society.)
14. *Clemens Alexandrinus.* By H. U. MEYBOOM. (Leiden. 1912.)

And other Works.

;

AN article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1904 gave a general account of the chief points of interest in the views of Clement of Alexandria. At that date the admirable edition of the Seventh Book of the *Stromateis* by Hort and Mayor had recently appeared: Eugène de Faye's attractive work was comparatively new: and a good deal was being written, especially in Germany, about the responsibility of Clement for the hellenizing of early Christianity. The works named at the head of this article will suffice to indicate how numerous and how various are the writings which have been published about Clement during the last ten years.

First in importance comes Dr. Stählin's critical edition

in the series of texts of the Greek Fathers of the first three centuries which is being produced by the Prussian Academy. Dr. Bigg, writing in 1886, could say 'It is much to be desired that some competent editor should present Clement's writings to the world in a less repulsive form than they bear at present, overlaid as they are with the mist of long neglect.' The writer in this Review for July 1904 could still remark that 'the large number of improvements which have been introduced [by Hort and Mayor] into a single book of the *Miscellanies* show how great a boon a good critical edition of the whole work would be.' Dr. Stählin has put the matter on an entirely different footing. His edition, besides being much more convenient to use than its predecessors, contains a text which is in itself an immense improvement. It is no more possible to say of that text that it is final than of the text of any other author; but it is based on scientific principles which are fully explained in the prolegomena, and, when further improvements are made, these will come either from new discoveries or from further development of hints supplied by Dr. Stählin himself. The editor has also been most careful in tracing the immediate sources of Clement's quotations and allusions: it is probable that few, if any, indisputable references have escaped his vigilance. The arrangement of the fragments in the third volume is excellent and complete: there can be no question that this edition, which it would be presumptuous to praise, has greatly facilitated work of all kinds on Clement, and has rendered possible investigations, such as those of Dr. Scham on the use of the optative in Clement, which would previously have lacked any sufficient basis.

The difficult questions about Clement's sources, his relation to Greek philosophy and the several philosophical schools, his religious and philosophical views, have given rise to a considerable number of monographs. Those cited above may serve as specimens, and reference will be made to some of their results at a later point in this article. But it is of special interest for us that two works of considerable dimensions and wide range, dealing with all the main subjects of interest in regard to Clement,

should recently have appeared in English. Clement has had an attraction for English scholars. The best editor of Clement before Stählin was John Potter (1715), afterwards Archbishop, whose work has not ceased to be useful even now. Probably the best commentary on any part of Clement's work is Hort and Mayor's edition of the Seventh Book of the *Stromateis*; and Mr. Barnard's edition of the *Quis Dives Salvetur* comes near the same standard. The work of Mayor and Barnard is referred to by Stählin in appreciative terms. Dr. Bywater and Dr. Henry Jackson have contributed valuable textual suggestions. Dr. Westcott wrote an excellent article in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, covering a good deal of ground, and Dr. Bigg's Bampton Lectures, which have deservedly earned the honour of a reissue with valuable additions and corrections on points of detail, are as full of suggestions about Clement as about Origen. It is appropriate therefore that something should appear in English on a larger scale.

Dr. Patrick's book contains the Croall Lecture for 1899-1900. The delay in publication till 1914 is unfortunately due, as the author tells us in his Preface, to his impaired health; he has been able to utilize the interval not only to employ Stählin's text, but also to reconsider and correct some points in his original treatment. The lectures deal with the writings of Clement, the relation of Christianity to Hellenic culture, Clement's views on the Nature of God and the Person and work of Christ, Clement's ethics, and his use of Scripture. If the lectures were delivered substantially as they are printed, they must have required very close attention from their hearers; for the matter is tightly packed and the argument is for the most part very concisely expressed. Possibly the process of revision may have removed some features which made them easier for an audience. But, however this may be, the volume is very valuable in its printed form. Clement's views are fully illustrated at every point from his writings, the references being conveniently given at the foot of the page. The appendices contain not only discussions of some points which could not well appear in the lectures



themselves, but also bibliographical material and an analysis of the three chief works of Clement which, particularly as regards the *Stromateis*, will give help to the reader where he is often likely to need it. It may be added that, while Dr. Patrick is properly averse to committing himself to an opinion when he does not feel certain, his considered judgement is rarely at fault, and it is probable that the reader will seldom find himself in disagreement when Dr. Patrick has made up his mind.

Mr. Tollinton's sub-title, 'A Study in Christian Liberalism,' suggests that his object is, in part, a different one. He does not neglect the detailed investigation of those many points about Clement which every student must admit to be preliminary to any inferences as to Clement's position in the Church. There is far too much that is uncertain about Clement for any writer to be justified in making such inferences without first defining his own position in regard to these uncertainties. So Mr. Tollinton discusses the order and date of Clement's works; he gives what are in effect summaries with commentary of the *Protrepticus*, the *Paedagogus*, and the *Quis Dives Salvetur*; he contributes to the consideration of those problems with which Dr. Patrick has dealt, and he isolates several questions for separate investigation more explicitly than Dr. Patrick has done. The volumes shew a careful study of Clement, and they are readable as well as instructive. The early chapters, particularly that in which a brief account is given of six contemporaries of Clement, will do much to put the general reader in possession of such information as will help to interpret the intellectual environment in which Clement wrote. But the sub-title, which Mr. Tollinton explains as being 'intended to have a religious and only a religious significance,' leads to the consideration, often explicitly stated but hardly ever entirely absent from the author's mind, of parallels between Clement's age and other periods of the history of the Church, especially our own. In most cases there is a gain in clearness when a writer approaches his subject from a definite point of view, and it is certainly desirable that, when he does so,

he should put his readers in possession of the secret. It is often assumed that a writer cannot allow that he has a special point of view without admitting himself to be a biassed witness, but this assumption seems to involve a confusion of thought. It is probable that no writer is entirely devoid of preconceptions or is in that sense impartial. If his mind were a *tabula rasa* it is hard to see how he could write a book on any subject. The mere fact that he omits to state his point of view does not prove that he has not got one: and whatever manipulation of evidence is desirable in the interest of his thesis may still be present when he has not avowed that interest, and is in that case less likely to be detected by the reader. There would therefore be no reason to complain of an author for saying that he has made up his mind on a certain point and writes in order to maintain his view, unless he intends to misstate the evidence. It is probable enough that, if he intended to misstate the evidence, he would not first put his readers on their guard by calling attention to his prejudice. In any case however Mr. Tollinton does not misstate the evidence: such lessons as he feels justified in drawing from Clement's teaching are based upon an honest examination of that teaching, and there is no reason for suspecting that he has only taken from Clement what he wanted to find there. Whether Clement can properly be regarded as a 'Christian liberal' is a different question about which something will be said below.

Clement is admittedly a very difficult writer. His language is often obscure, and the connexion of his thought is sometimes obscurer still. Different portions of his writings may be used to support different opinions. Mr. Tollinton's twenty-first chapter is occupied with a collection of passages, given both in the original and in translation, in the hope that 'some, who have not time for a fuller study, may be glad in this minor degree to come into direct contact with Clement's writings'; but it is probable that any reader who attempted to study the extracts in this chapter alone, without reading what Mr. Tollinton has to say about the subjects elsewhere, would be a good deal

puzzled. Far worse would be the fate of one who endeavoured to read only the *Extracts from the Writings of Clement of Alexandria* produced by the Theosophical Publishing Society; without a commentary he might find it hard to gather any meaning from them. Even the sensible and plain introduction prefixed by Mr. Rufus Jones to his *Selections from the Writings of Clement of Alexandria*, and the exclusion from those selections of the more difficult portions, does not make the selections into easy reading for the average man. There are not many passages in Clement which can safely be interpreted without the context. Not that the context always makes the meaning certain: the words of the text are sometimes doubtful, even after all that Stählin and others have done; Clement's habit of working fragments of quotations into his own language makes it always necessary to think how far such a fragment may have coloured his words; the argument is frequently tortuous. Clement is aware that he is often obscure, and he is prepared on occasion to defend this obscurity, though his exact motives have been differently interpreted. Perhaps it is going too far to contrast, as some have done, the difficulty of the *Stromateis* with the clearness of the other writings: Clement is not one of those whose connexion of thought is easy to follow, and his argument appears to get lost even in certain parts of the simpler treatises. But in the *Stromateis* his habit of cautious statement becomes an obsession. Obviously this habit presents great temptations to his critics. It is easy to dismiss as inconsistencies what ought rather to be considered as complementary statements, intended in each case to guard against an opposite exaggeration. Unfortunately too his critics have not always learned a warning from his example. A recent writer on Clement, Dr. Verkuyt, points out truly that, while Clement may have had intelligible reasons for not being too clear, his commentators have no similar excuse. Yet they have occasionally availed themselves of the same practice. In particular, the connexion between the different questions which they have discussed is difficult to disentangle.

Clement stands at the meeting-point of two traditions, the Christian and the Hellenic. His works inevitably give rise to a great many questions, apparently separate from each other, which always may and certainly sometimes do intersect. Some of these main questions may be set out here, with the view of illustrating, if possible, the relation between them.

## II

Before any inferences can be drawn from an author's writings, it is evidently necessary to arrive at such conclusions as are attainable in regard to the dates of his life and the dates and order of his several writings. External evidence gives us little help in the case of Clement. That he resided in Alexandria for some years before the persecution under Severus in 202-3 of our era ; that he left at the time of this persecution, and that he was alive in 211 and dead in 215—so much is established on sufficient testimony. Perhaps we ought to add the statement quoted in Eusebius that he had written something before Victor was bishop in Rome (*i.e.* before 189-190) ; but the passage is not quite so clear as could be wished, and, even if it be accepted, it would not necessarily follow that any of the works which have reached us were written before that date. Internal evidence adds something but not so much as might be expected. Some authors shew very clear traces of what is happening at the moment of writing ; but Clement is not one of those. We could safely say of a great deal of what has reached us under his name that it must have been written at about the end of the Second century, that it could not have been written much earlier or much later : but there is very little of it to which we could give a more definite date. The author's personal allusions are interesting (the reference to his travels and his teachers is the most illuminating, though it may be impossible to give names to the teachers), but they do not help us in regard to the date. Even the allusions to persecutions are not of much use. Those allusions are surprisingly few, especially when we remember that, as Mr. Tollinton has pointed out, the



reference appears to be to a regular condition of things, and not to the circumstances of any one year. Clement could discuss the possibility of martyrdom, and the duty of meeting or avoiding it, in a dispassionate way which may astonish us, when we reflect that the individual might at any moment have to face the question, not as an academic but as a practical one. This dispassionate tone and the general character of the allusions, make it difficult to base any argument for a date upon them. To argue, for instance, that the second book of the *Stromateis* could not have been written before 202-3 appears to be precarious, for the allusion to martyrdom could not be considered free from rhetorical exaggeration unless the reader is intended to think of the long line of Christian confessors from the beginning rather than of those at a particular date.

Of the extant works, the *Protrepticus* is generally held to be the earliest : not because of any special indication of date contained in the work itself, but because the *Paedagogus* looks back to it (as it also looks forward to another work which may or may not be the *Stromateis*), and it is most natural to think, in the absence of special reasons to the contrary, that the three works were composed in the order in which they were meant to be used. Mr. Tollinton indeed thinks that the first book of the *Stromateis* must have been written before anything else, on the ground that it begins by discussing the question whether a Christian should write at all ; and, though he is prepared to allow that other works may have been composed earlier for private circulation, he regards it as 'the one assured fact in the whole intricate inquiry that Clement had written no book for publication before he undertook the composition of the *Stromateis*.' There may seem to be some improbability in an author, who had already published works, undertaking to prove in a subsequent work that such publication is under some circumstances justifiable, but yet Mr. Tollinton's inference is less certain than it appears to be at first sight. There is always a possibility that the publication of earlier writings by Clement may have provoked criticism,

and that it is this criticism to which Clement is in effect replying at the opening of the *Stromateis*, though his reply is, according to his wont, quite general in form. But apart from this, there is surely a difference between the position of an author when he is adding a new specimen of a type of work which is already familiar, and when he is developing a new form of composition. Clement cannot really at any stage of his career have had to discuss the question whether a Christian should write anything at all : though he may put this question at the opening of the *Stromateis*, he is only doing so in order to secure a general assent from all his readers, in the consciousness that the particular type of writing on which he is engaged may require a further explanation which he proceeds to give subsequently. It would have been wholly irrelevant to begin the *Protrepticus* by such a discussion.

The real nature of the *Protrepticus* has, it is true, been the subject of some doubt. Overbeck, in an article published rather more than thirty years ago which is justly regarded as epoch-making for the study of Clement, argued that the work was to be distinguished from the writings of the apologists and to be looked upon as original in its conception, because it is addressed to Christians, or at least to those who are intending to become Christians, and not to those outside. In the same way Dr. Geffcken describes Clement as not, strictly speaking, 'an apologist.' But, while the character of the audience addressed does make a considerable difference, that difference may be overstated. Clement has no occasion to give an account of Christian morality such as that which gives distinction to the apology of Aristides, and legal arguments like those of Tertullian would have been out of place, even if Clement had been capable of them. But much of the *Protrepticus* falls into line with the contents of the Second-century apologetic writings, just as in its turn it was freely used by Arnobius and other later apologists ; and, however early we may put the date of the *Protrepticus*, it is impossible to reach a date so early that it should be the first of its kind, or that its appearance should require an

explanation. Overbeck may be quite right in his estimate of its originality, and yet that originality may be of a kind that would almost certainly have passed without notice at the time. The work as a whole is far better in composition than the earlier apologies ; its contents may have in some sense a more permanent value than those of its predecessors, because a considerable part of them is devoted to an exhortation urging those who are already sympathetically inclined to make the venture of faith (‘ an appeal to the educated,’ as Mr. Tollinton has called it) : but yet it cannot be thought of as a new departure in the sense in which the *Stromateis* is new. If then we are not convinced of Mr. Tollinton’s ‘ one assured fact,’ there appears to be no reason left for doubting the common view which puts the *Protrepticus* first in order of the extant writings.

How far do similar considerations apply to the *Paedagogus* ? Here we cannot point to any earlier extant work by another author, and say that the *Paedagogus*, though it may shew originality and development, is after all only another specimen of a type of work which was already known. Nor again have we any reason to suppose that the discovery of an earlier work which is at present unknown to us would diminish our impression of its originality. The first of the three books treats of the Logos as Educator, leading on to a long discussion in the two remaining books of the effect which such education should have in regulating the life of the individual Christian. The author goes into great detail. The originality of much of this detail has been questioned. It has been supposed to be largely derived from handbooks or from previous writers, mainly non-Christian ; and we may allow for this as a possibility, though it must be remembered at the same time that a teacher who discusses such subjects as the shoes which the ladies of his community should wear on various occasions, is hardly likely to take his illustrations of their habits from the customs of another community or a different date. In any case the adaptation of this material to Christian uses, and the whole argument of the first book, is profoundly original. But this originality is not of such a kind

as to require a special apology. The first book of the *Paedagogus*, however new in conception it may be, fits on very well to the end of the *Protrepticus*, and the moral discussions of the later books could hardly be objected to in principle. The author of the *Stromateis*, when undertaking to discuss the relation of Christianity to philosophy, might begin by a preliminary consideration of the desirability of discussing such matters in writing, even though he were already known as the author of the *Paedagogus*.

But certain critics, from Wendland to Stählin, have argued, on other grounds than that taken by Mr. Tollinton, that the first four books of the *Stromateis* were written before the *Paedagogus*, though the remaining books were written after that work. This subject is excellently treated by Dr. Patrick in one of his appendices. The main reason suggested by Wendland for his theory is the fact that, in the second book of the *Paedagogus*, Clement refers to a question as having been discussed by him in a treatise 'on continence': we have no evidence of a separate treatise on this subject by Clement being known in antiquity, and the question is discussed in certain parts of the earlier books of the *Stromateis*. Ancient authors were often in the habit of referring to their own works by sub-titles corresponding to parts of their contents, and it is argued that Clement is adopting this procedure here. It should be added that the earlier books of the *Stromateis* contain no reference to the *Paedagogus*, though the later books do: but this fact, while it prevents us from rejecting the hypothesis of Wendland, can hardly be considered to afford positive evidence in its favour, since such references are largely due to accident. Dr. Patrick shews that there is a good deal to be said against the hypothesis. In another passage of the second book of the *Paedagogus* Clement refers to a different question of a cognate character as having been discussed by him, and this question, though there are allusions to it in the *Paedagogus* elsewhere, is not discussed in the *Stromateis*. It is true that Clement does not say here that he is referring to his treatise 'on continence': but it appears from this passage that, unless Clement's memory is very inaccurate,



some writing of his has been lost. The fourth book of the *Stromateis* begins with a programme of the subjects which the author is going to treat. The following books correspond as fairly to that programme as we can expect from so discursive a writer as Clement. It is not easy to make a break between the fourth and fifth books, and there is perhaps something to be said, from the point of view of those who think that the *Stromateis* were written at two different dates, for making the break between the fifth and sixth. But the solution favoured by Dr. Patrick seems to meet the facts best. He suggests that Clement had written a separate treatise 'on continence' before the *Paedagogus*, and that he subsequently incorporated the bulk of that work in the *Stromateis*. The effect of this incorporation was to cause the loss of the early treatise as a separate work: and if we may think of that treatise as incorporated in its main features but not literally transcribed, we can understand how some of the subjects discussed in the separate treatise (for instance those referred to in *Paed.* ii 94) may have been omitted from the portion used for the *Stromateis*. Perhaps it is significant that Dr. Scham makes no use of Wendland's hypothesis: and like so many views about Clement, it ought to be regarded as doubtful at the best.

If we are content to believe that the *Protrepticus*, *Paedagogus*, and *Stromateis* were probably composed in that order, the eighth book of the *Stromateis* and the two works attached to it (the *Excerpta Theodoti* and the *Eclogae Propheticae*) introduce us to a new set of problems. Eight books of the *Stromateis* were known in antiquity; and, though we hear of a manuscript which gave the *Quis Dives* in place of the eighth book, there is no evidence of anything else having been known as the eighth book than that which has reached us under this name. But the extant eighth book, besides being short, disjointed, and fragmentary, is quite unlike the other books in manner, and its matter, in its present form, could hardly have served Clement's purpose. Zahn endeavoured to shew that the existing fragment and the two sets of extracts are to be regarded as belonging to the eighth book: subsequent critics have

tended with increasing conviction to reject the belief that any one of the three works is, as it stands, a part of the eighth book, but to accept Zahn's hypothesis that the three are somehow connected together. Dr. von Arnim made the valuable suggestion that all three are to be looked upon as extracts, accompanied by notes, made by Clement, with a view to subsequent treatment of the questions in the eighth book of the *Stromateis* or elsewhere. Dr. Ernst has endeavoured to shew that the extant 'eighth book' consists of rough material which was used up by Clement in the earlier books. He thinks, in effect, that the author's followers discovered after his death some notes for the earlier books of the *Stromateis* which had survived by accident. Failing to understand the true nature of what they had found, they supposed that these notes were the continuation of the *Stromateis*, and gave them in consequence their present position as the 'eighth book.' Certainly there is not much of the 'eighth book' which cannot be accounted for on Dr. Ernst's method, and his comparison of passages in the 'eighth' with corresponding passages in the earlier books is at least a very illuminating study in what we may suppose to have been Clement's method of working. But we may note that Dr. Scham's results do not entirely agree with those of Dr. Ernst. Considerations based on grammatical usage are of value, if we can exclude accident, just because we can hardly think of an author as altering his use of the optative in deference to a philosophical theory which he holds at the moment. It is therefore somewhat remarkable that Dr. Scham should be able to point to a difference between the use of the optative in the first four chapters of the 'eighth book' on the one hand and in the remaining chapters and the two sets of extracts on the other, thus confirming one of the observations of Von Arnim who, on entirely different grounds, regarded the first four chapters as belonging together and as being immediately followed by a break. It may be added that Dr. Scherer, when writing on Clement's theory of knowledge, proposes to exclude the 'eighth book' from consideration, because of its disputed authorship, 'although

the most remunerative material for our subject would be found in it.' Dr. Scherer's book was published three years before that of Dr. Ernst, and his attention may not have been specially directed to the point; but Dr. Scherer could hardly have used such language had he not thought that there is philosophical material in the 'eighth book' which is independent of that to be found elsewhere in Clement, and he must therefore be supposed to dissent in advance from Dr. Ernst's conclusion. There is room for more discussion of this 'eighth book' and its affinities, for the results are not yet final or convincing: fortunately these questions, though they contain much of that fascination which often adheres to questions that are complicated and possibly insoluble, have a comparatively small bearing on the other problems relating to Clement.

The *Quis Dives Salvetur*, a homily on riches, depends for its date mainly on the inference that can be drawn from one sentence in it. Dr. Patrick translates the sentence thus: 'As to the mystery of the Saviour, you may learn from my exposition concerning First Principles and Theology.' A treatise on First Principles is apparently promised in the *Stromateis*: and it is accordingly argued that the *Quis Dives* must be later in date than the *Stromateis*. Von Arnim disputed the inference on the ground that no one would in the course of a sermon recommend his hearers to study one of his works. Even if we assume that no preacher is capable of this, we have to remember that an ancient author was obliged to embody in his text what a modern would put in a note, and a published version of a sermon might surely contain a reference to a fuller discussion in another place of a topic to which only brief allusion could be made in the discourse itself. Yet it may be doubted whether Von Arnim's interpretation (with which many critics agree, though Mr. Tollinton dissents) is not after all right. There is nothing in the original to correspond to the word 'my' in Dr. Patrick's translation as given above. Clement may mean this, but he says 'the exposition,' not 'my exposition.' It is possible therefore that he intends only to put the consideration

of this mystery on one side as belonging more properly to another subject, and not to say that he has himself already treated that subject. Dr. Scham's statistics, which are entitled to a certain weight because they are independent of any theory except linguistic considerations, point to the *Quis Dives* as coming rather late in the order of Clement's writings. But it is difficult to compare a sermon with a philosophical treatise in such a matter: and there does not appear to be any certain ground for dating the sermon at present.

Among the lost writings of Clement, the *Hypotyposes* have a special interest. It may seem an unimportant matter to determine whether a work of which we possess only one considerable fragment, in a Latin version which is admitted by its translator to have been altered for doctrinal reasons, and a certain number of much shorter though sometimes interesting fragments, was written earlier or later than the extant works. But the orthodoxy of the *Hypotyposes* is denied by Photius and, in more moderate language, by Cassiodorus. The question accordingly arises whether, if we are to believe that the *Hypotyposes* was less orthodox than Clement's other writings, his unorthodoxy should be regarded as an earlier or a later stage in his mental development. This question can hardly be answered on general grounds of probability. It is not impossible that a man should become less orthodox with advancing years. It is not even certain that he will be more orthodox as a presbyter than he was as a layman. Dr. Patrick regards as weighty the consideration that 'it is altogether inconsistent with the esteem in which Clement was held by Alexander, and with the services which he rendered to the Church in his later years, to suppose that there was an increased divergence from the ecclesiastical norm, and not a progressive movement towards it.' If the divergence were of such a kind as to be generally recognized, we might admit the force of this argument. But, whatever may be thought of the orthodoxy of the passages quoted by Photius (and it is not an easy matter to be certain, even when they are judged by the standard of later formulae),



there is no reason to suppose that Clement's contemporaries would necessarily have condemned them. Eusebius may not be a good witness to the orthodoxy of a work as compared with the Nicene standard, but he is a good enough witness as to the general opinion of the Church, and he does not condemn the *Hypotyposes*. If that work, which was long and important in scale, had represented a point of view from which Clement afterwards receded and of which he was later ashamed, we should have expected him to take any opportunity which his later writings offered for correcting his earlier mistakes. If however the *Hypotyposes* appeared later, there is no evidence to justify us in believing that the work was of such a kind as to cause a scandal.

We can hardly decide the question on these lines. Two other general considerations remain, which tell on opposite sides. One is the feeling that it is difficult to conceive of Clement as leaving a large work unfinished, as the *Stromateis* seems to be, and devoting himself to another equally large. There may be reasons any one of which, if we knew of it, would make this intelligible to us, but none that has hitherto been suggested seems quite satisfactory. Hence we are naturally inclined to place the *Hypotyposes* before the *Stromateis*; but then we are confronted with the difficulty, on which Mr. Tollinton lays stress, of understanding how Clement could have inserted in the *Stromateis* so many specimens of commentary on passages of Scripture and yet have refrained from referring to his eight books on the same subject, if these eight books were already in existence. A further possibility, which does not appear to have been considered, is that Clement may have been engaged on these two large works simultaneously, adding to one or the other as his inclination led him towards philosophical or exegetical work. We are justified in assuming, from the state in which the *Stromateis* has reached us, that the author never finished it: but we could not have drawn this inference from the references in antiquity, if we had not possessed at least a great part of the actual work. Have we any more reason for supposing that the *Hypotyposes* was finished? Is it not possible

that Clement may have been engaged on both at the time of his death, and that both were published by his friends subsequently ?

In view of the divergent opinions expressed, there is room for further study, both of the passages on which Photius bases his charge of unorthodoxy, and also of the *Stromateis*, with a view to discovering whether, as certain passages give some slight ground for assuming, there is any difference on grounds of orthodoxy between the earlier and later books. Any results at which we can arrive on such points may have an important bearing on the development of Christian thought at Alexandria during this time. It looks as though the data were not sufficient to make us very confident of positive conclusions, and as though the number of points which must remain uncertain were too great for us to be able to fill in the detail of Clement's life ; but the last twenty years have helped so much that it would be rash to regard further agreement as outside the range of possibility.

### III

The important position occupied by Clement in the history of Christian tradition has always been recognized. His activity falls at that date when evidence as to the Christian Church first becomes fairly full, and it has long been felt that the true method of reasoning is to test our materials by the data provided at the end of the Second century and then to argue back to the preceding period. But Clement is not an easy writer to use for this purpose. We are not referring at present to the difficulties of interpreting his place in the development of doctrine, but merely to the evidence which he gives as to the facts. There is more to be gained from his writings about the practices of the Church of his day than used at one time to be thought : the suspicion of De Faye that he was more of a Churchman than he is sometimes imagined to be has been justified to some extent by recent researches. But still the allusions that are definite and unassailable remain disappointingly few. There are clear traces of an ecclesiastical order in the

background : there is no evidence of that anarchy which has been the terror or the ideal of successive ecclesiastical historians : but it is useless to expect from Clement much more than a dim outline of a picture which must be filled in, if at all, from other sources. If we knew the details of the ritual of Alexandria or of the liturgical language in use, we might perhaps recognize many traces of it in Clement's language : it is not Clement's habit to explain the source of an expression with which his hearers or readers may be assumed to be familiar, so that many such instances of influence may be impossible to recognize. There is room for more examination of his works from this point of view, yet probably we shall remain in the same position of having to be very careful what inferences, particularly what negative inferences, we draw from him on this subject. Mr. Tollinton's chapters are useful as a collection of material ; but they leave something to be done, both because, in spite of his caution, he draws some inferences from facts which may be accidental, and because some real difficulties (for instance, the strange view about forgiveness which occurs in the *Quis Dives* and is alluded to elsewhere) receive inadequate explanation.

In regard to the canon of Scripture, Clement may seem likely to be a very good witness. His frequent quotations and still more frequent allusions confirm this anticipation up to a certain point. However, the very mass of material proves an obstacle, on account of the quality as well as the quantity. Anyone who turns from an endeavour to find traces of the New Testament in the Apostolic Fathers to a corresponding study in Clement will feel at once that the advantage of having so many passages with which to deal is balanced by the increasing complexity of the phenomena. Both Dr. Patrick and Mr. Tollinton have done valuable work in sorting these phenomena and trying to discover tests for the inferences which may or may not be drawn. They both begin by an examination of the Old Testament ; and this course is clearly a wise one, because the Old Testament Canon of Clement's time is known, at least approximately. The two writers agree in their main results,

which may be summarized as follows. Clement shews knowledge of all the books in the Hebrew canon except Ruth, the Song of Songs, and Obadiah : Mr. Tollinton adds Nehemiah to the exceptions, but without laying any stress upon the omission, and neither writer lays stress on the omission of Ruth or Obadiah. In regard to the Song of Songs, Mr. Tollinton says that there is 'possibly some significance in the fact that' it is nowhere quoted. It is not quite clear what kind of significance he attaches to this fact. If he only means that the absence of quotation suggests that Clement was not particularly fond of the book, rather than that the omission to quote is due to accident, this may be true, though it is difficult to point to a particular passage in Clement and say that he must have quoted the Song of Songs there had he been fond of it. But Mr. Tollinton speaks of Clement as possibly questioning the wisdom of the decision which had, after much hesitation, accepted the Song of Songs as Scripture ; and this appears to suggest that the absence of quotation means that Clement did not regard the book as Scripture. Such an inference would not be warranted : if we know on other grounds that the recognized Scriptures included the Song of Songs at this time, the only inference which we can draw is that Clement could abstain from quoting one of the books of Scripture.

Further conclusions of a negative kind are given by Dr. Patrick, all of them as the result of very careful detailed examination. The 'more or less infrequent reference to particular books' cannot be shewn to have a bearing 'on the measure of authority which he attached to them.' The absence of words like 'the writing,' 'it is written,' 'the Spirit saith' does not justify any conclusions as to the authority of a book. 'No conclusion as to the relative authority which he assigned to any book of the same class or group can be drawn from the number of phrases or epithets implying authority or inspiration which he employs in reference to such, or the relative frequency of such phrases or epithets.' Again (and this is important) 'our conclusions as to the usage of Clement in regard to the authority or inspiration of particular books would be modi-



fied if one or other of the great works of Clement had perished.' Nearly all the books of the Old Testament Apocrypha are quoted or referred to, and there is no clear line of demarcation between them and the canonical books as regards authority. Some are merely referred to incidentally without any mark of authority, but so are some of the canonical books: several of the apocryphal books are given definite marks of authority, and some of them are extensively used. As the Septuagint makes no distinction between the two sets of books, their relation to each other in Clement is only what might be expected.

Though the number of allusions to the New Testament writings is very much larger than to the Old Testament, the negative results of the study of the Old Testament allusions have to be borne in mind. There is little room for questions about Clement's recognition of 'the gospel' as authoritative. That he recognized the Four Gospels is as clear as that Irenaeus or Tertullian recognized them, though the evidence is of a different kind. That he treated them as on a different level from other Gospels, such as the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, is certain from at least one passage. Yet it would be dangerous to draw inferences which involve that his expressions even on such a point as this are always pedantically accurate: for he refers to the story of the Rich Young Man as occurring in 'all the other Gospels' besides St. Mark, and yet the evidence for his knowledge and use of the Fourth Gospel is very strong. Next to the Gospel comes 'the Apostle': and few of the epithets which Clement uses of the Old Testament scriptures are not used also of St. Paul. His list includes all the Epistles except Philemon, an exception which raises no difficulties, and includes also Hebrews, though Clement observed the difference in style between that writing and the Pauline Epistles, accounting for it by supposing Luke to have translated a Hebrew original. When we pass beyond 'the Gospel' and 'the Apostle,' we come to greater uncertainties. But these uncertainties are not due to Clement having used only the writings mentioned. They are due on the contrary to his extensive use of writings which ultimately

fell outside the limits of the Canon. He evidently attached great weight to the *Shepherd of Hermas*; he quotes the letter of the Roman Clement in a way which implies authority; he is fond of referring to the *Epistle of Barnabas*, though he differs from his author in a way in which, as has been truly observed, we can hardly imagine him as differing from St. Paul. These are only illustrations; there are other writings to which it is practically certain, and still others to which it is probable, that he attached apostolic authority. If he had been questioned as to the importance which he attached to them, he would no doubt have admitted that that importance was different in kind from such as could be attached to the other literature which he cites, even to the writings of Plato. It is true that he is prepared to allow inspiration not only to Plato but to Metrodorus, though he was an Epicurean, and it must be admitted, without adopting the somewhat fanciful opinion that he attributes inspiration to himself, that he allows for a wide influence of inspiration. But though the result of inspiration is everywhere the same, as it is the Spirit of God which enables man of whatever nationality or antecedents to arrive at the truth, the test of inspiration is different in non-Christian and Christian writers. The former, even Plato, are treated as inspired because they have arrived at some approach to Christian truth. But apostolic writers have an additional claim to be treated as inspired. If Clement had found a view in St. Paul which he could not regard as in harmony with the truth as elsewhere revealed, he might have had to adopt a forced explanation and to neglect if not reject the literal sense, but he could not regard the passage as of no consequence in the way which he might apply to Plato. What applies to St. Paul applies to the other apostolic writers. Any apostolic writing has to be treated with respect: Clement need not cite or make use of every passage in it, as indeed he is not bound to make use of every passage in those books which he values most; but he cannot, if challenged, refuse to allow it a certain measure of authority, and he must endeavour to find a method which will harmonize it with other passages

or with his own view. It seems to follow that we can only draw inferences of a positive kind, such as that Clement's use of a book shews that he knew it, and can draw no negative inference from his omission to cite any book.

The evidence for Clement's knowledge of most of the New Testament writings is full, and there is no doubt as to some books, for instance the Apocalypse, where some doubt would not have been surprising. The evidence for St. James and 2 Peter is slight, and there does not appear to be any real evidence for 3 John. But Eusebius tells us that the *Hypotyposes* commented on 'the remaining Catholic Epistles' as well as on Jude: it is unlikely that Eusebius is inaccurate, and perhaps it is still less likely that Photius, whose opinion of the *Hypotyposes* was so unfavourable, should have omitted to mention that some of the Epistles which he recognized were left out, had this been the case. As regards the books admitted by Clement, we are left with a warning that, even where the evidence is so extensive, there may be many elements of doubt, a warning which the students of the Second century have always to bear in mind. In studying an early Christian writer, it is wise to be careful before assuming that what looks like an allusion to a New Testament book gives positive proof that the writer knew that book; it is quite another matter to argue that, because no passage can be produced from the writer which can pass the test, he was therefore ignorant of the book in question. A volume of sermons recently published contains so many references to Scripture that the author has thought it worth while to append an index of Scriptural Passages. Every book in the New Testament except one appears in that index, most of them several times. The one exception is St. James, which is not the exception that would have been expected, as the sermons are largely practical in character. Yet there is no reason to suppose that the preacher is ignorant of St. James: it merely happens that, through what can only be described as accident, he has had no occasion to make use of that Epistle. Caution of a similar kind is desirable in estimating the bearing of Clement's evidence as to the

closing of the New Testament Canon. A good many negative statements can be made. It is clearly not the case that only those writings which subsequently came to be placed in the first class were admitted by Clement as authoritative. There is no evidence to shew that he regarded any writing which he admitted to be apostolic as not being entitled to the greatest respect. Dr. Patrick has dealt successfully with Leipoldt's contention that Clement does not regard the Acts as canonical : we cannot draw a line between the Acts and many other books which he certainly did so regard. He would not have been prepared to place a writing of his own day on a level with any apostolic writing : but this is going no further than Ignatius did in his allusion to St. Paul. The distinction between the Four Gospels and the *Gospel according to the Egyptians*, which probably affords the clearest instance of a difference between the authority of different books, does not imply that the *Gospel according to the Egyptians* is not, though on a lower level than the Four, to be treated with respect. The limits of the Canon have not been definitely closed, though we can trace the beginnings of such a movement as would ultimately lead to its closing.

Still, we have to be on our guard against any rash inference to the effect that Alexandria was behind the other Christian centres in its recognition of a Canon. Mr. Tollinton tells us that 'the conception of a Canon of the New Testament, as a definite and settled collection of the Scriptures, is far less clear in the Alexandrine Father than it is in Irenaeus, Tertullian, the Muratorian fragment, possibly even in the scheme of Melito, so far as our information goes.' If Mr. Tollinton means that the evidence to be derived on this subject is less from Clement than from the other writings named, that is true but not surprising. Special circumstances lead Irenaeus to be particularly careful as to the works which he admits, for he was a controversialist, though of an unusual type, and Clement never was. Tertullian was always a controversialist, and it was worth his while to reject and abuse the *Shepherd of Hermas*. The Muratorian fragment contains a list of



books; Clement's admitted writings have no occasion to give such a list, though the Muratorian fragment can hardly be very far removed from the evidence to be derived from those writings, since it has been supposed by eminent authorities to be compiled by Clement himself. If Mr. Tollinton means that Clement was one of those to whom it is more natural to be inclusive than exclusive, and to wish to recognize the influence of inspiration over as wide an area as possible: that again is true, but it does not help us much in regard to the view of the Church in Alexandria. The general impression derived from a study of Clement's writings is that, when his mental attitude and this inclusive tendency are borne in mind, there is more of the conception of a New Testament Canon than we had a right to expect. Much remained to be done in the way of deciding which of the writings that claimed apostolic authority were justified in their claim, but Clement seems already to have reached the stage of treating all apostolic writings as entitled to authority. He may not have derived the same help from all writings which he regarded as apostolic: he may even on some points have derived greater help from others, which he definitely did not so regard; but there does appear to be a difference in him between apostolic writings and the writings of a later date, as real, though it was based on different principles, as the difference between apostolic and non-Christian writing. Clement goes out of his way to attach weight to such testimonies from non-Christian writers as commend themselves to his reason and his conscience, but this weight is not based on the same principle as that which he attaches to apostolic writings. And there does seem to be a similar distinction within Christian writings themselves. No doubt the comparatively long cessation of Christian writings, which could cause Clement to ask whether a Christian should write at all, helped this distinction, as well as the fact that several of the few Christians who are known to have written were led by circumstances to confine themselves to a small part, and that not the most intimate part, of the Christian revelation: we may seem therefore to be

asserting the existence of a distinction between two things one of which hardly existed. But Clement has been supposed, though on inadequate grounds, to be acquainted with the work of Athenagoras: had he had occasion to refer to it, it is impossible to avoid the feeling that, however much he might have been in sympathy with the passage quoted, he would have cited it because he agreed with it and not because it came with any of that authority, however ill-defined, to which the least of the apostolic writings could lay claim. The distinction appears certainly to be present to Clement, even though it may be hard to point to convincing evidence for it.

The large use made by Clement of nearly all the books in the New Testament causes him to be regarded as an important authority on the text. It is not certain that the text of Alexandria at the end of the Second century agrees in all respects with what was originally written: but, if we have reached the text of that date, we have at any rate got back much farther than we had a right to expect. Unfortunately it is not easy to reach this point. Clement had a knowledge of Scripture which has been justly praised. But this knowledge has its disadvantages from the point of view of discovering his text. His familiarity with its language led him to work single words or groups of words into the structure of his sentences, introducing such modifications as may be required for the thought or the grammar of his own context. It is a delicate matter to decide how far in each case he may have modified the language of his original, and how far such modification, when allowed for, may still leave room for inference as to the particular text which he had in his mind. Again it does not follow that the text of which he is thinking is the text which he would have found in his copy: for his memory, though it must have been very great, was not infallible, and most of those who have occasion to make much use of their memory are aware, even if it serves them well on the main points, that they cannot place absolute reliance upon it for all details. The habit of thinking about a particular passage, though it

may render it almost impossible to forget the existence of that passage, has a curious tendency to fix small deviations in the mind, the origin of which is in some cases hard to discover. The fact that a man may quote the same passage from memory on more than one occasion in exactly the same form need not prove that this is the form in which his text would justify him in quoting it. Such considerations apply strongly in the case of Clement : and they make it necessary to lay most stress for textual purposes on the longer passages or on those for which Clement can hardly be supposed to have trusted his memory alone. Yet even here we have to remember that his memory, though it may not have been the sole source, may still have exerted some influence. When Clement referred to his copy in order to insert a quotation, there is no reason to doubt that he intended to quote accurately. But it would not be justifiable to think of him as of a copyist whose only object was to reproduce exactly what he found. He might refer to his copy wherever he felt a momentary doubt, trusting otherwise to his memory : and if, after proceeding in this way, he omitted to compare his transcript carefully with the original, he might well produce a result which differed in a considerable number of small points from what he thought himself to be copying. If he were led to comment on a particular word, it would no doubt be reasonable to suppose that he would see that it actually occurred in his original : in regard to minor points of order or other detail he might quite well be content with general agreement, since his object in consulting the original would only be to help his memory and, as he is capable of small deviations when he is quoting from memory, he need not have attached great importance to similar deviations when he professes to be copying. His respect for the language of Scripture did not prevent him from treating it freely ; and if he could adopt this course knowingly, he would also be capable of disregarding minor divergences as unimportant. A good memory does not cease to be a snare when a man is copying.

It is not surprising that few conclusions can be drawn

about Clement's text in spite of the patient labour which has been spent upon it. In regard to the Old Testament, Dr. Stählin has expressed himself as disappointed. This is the more to be regretted as, if we could class Clement definitely with the followers of the text of A or of B, we should have a standard by which to judge the deviations of which he is capable. The connexion on which Mr. Hart has recently dwelt between Clement's text of Ecclesiasticus and that of the 'Old Latin' hardly does more at present than suggest further puzzles. As regards the Gospels, Mr. Barnard's work has justified the claiming of Clement's support for the Western text, a conclusion which is naturally welcome to those scholars who share in the present reaction in favour of that text. Dr. Patrick has made studies on Clement's text of the Pauline Epistles which produce no very definite impression.

Two points might perhaps be borne in mind in the consideration of this problem, which has reached a highly technical stage. We might remember that in one respect Clement's support for the Western text, though it proves the existence of the text, does not necessarily prove its originality. The Western text is given to containing features which are either additions by those responsible for that text or omissions from the rival texts. Clement was not too particular as to the sources of his quotations. The list of non-canonical sayings to be gathered from his writings is not a short one, in spite of the distinction which he draws between the Four Gospels and the rest. Perhaps he would have a preference for any text which added anything to his material, and it might therefore be interesting to know what proportion of his agreement with the Western text is due to its additions rather than to its deviations. It would also be interesting to classify the allusions to the New Testament more definitely under the several works of Clement to which they belong. It is possible that such a study might, in view of the abundance of the material, afford some support to the suggestion that Clement altered the text which he preferred in the course of his life, and thus throw light on



the order of composition of his works. But probably the number of uncertain elements is at present too great to justify us in hoping much from such an inquiry.

#### IV

While the importance of Clement in relation to Christian tradition has long been recognized, it is only comparatively recently that serious attempts have been made to investigate his position in regard to non-Christian tradition. It is true that his writings have always been valued as a repository for classical quotations, many of which only survive there; and recent scholars have added a good deal to this material. An illustration of work of this kind is to be found in a note by Blass (in *Hermes* for 1900, p. 340), on fragments of Greek comedians which are embedded in Clement's text: there is no reason to doubt that Clement was fond of the gnomic wisdom to be found in the comedians, and while some of Blass' suggestions are no more than doubtful at the best, some of them have apparently convinced Stählin and will probably convince others. But much more fundamental questions are involved. There used to be an unfortunate tendency to draw a strict line between Christian and non-Christian authors, and to regard it as natural that the two sets of authors should be studied entirely apart, by different scholars working without reference to each other. Probably the ignorance of theologians about non-theological literature has never been so great as the ignorance of some non-theological scholars about Christian literature. Such scholars would have justified their position by a general suspicion that Christian literature was, not only concerned with special subjects which stand outside their range, but also barbarous and alien from the classical tradition in which they were interested. They would admit that a writer like Clement is useful as providing, in the absence of other sources, evidence which may help in completing our picture of a classical author; but their impression would probably be that such evidence is due only to the desire of the Christian writer to confute the

pagans, and not to any belief, in the mind of the Christian writer, that the Hellenic past belongs to him as much as, or more than, to his pagan contemporary. Yet a closer study of Clement shews that he undoubtedly held this belief, and that he neither thought that he forfeited his Greek birthright by becoming a Christian nor admitted a fundamental inconsistency between the two traditions. The personality of Clement contributes much to the elements of the problem which have to be considered : his individual importance, as Overbeck pointed out, is great, because he comes at the point where the two traditions meet and he set himself definitely to unite them so far as possible. But yet his writings have to be regarded as part of a long development, lasting from the time of the New Testament to that of Eusebius, and the study of that development is really a part of the study of the classical tradition. It is impossible to regard the Neo-Platonists as belonging to the classical tradition and the Christian Platonists as falling outside it; the relation between the two is reciprocally too close. The non-Christian philosophers were influenced by Christian developments in the same way as they were influenced by developments in non-Christian systems other than their own. They differed from these other systems, whether Christian or non-Christian, in some respects but not necessarily in all. So too, if some among the Christian writers were engaged in repudiating the Hellenic or the Roman past, others occupied themselves in the endeavour to shew that culture and philosophy found their completion and their most consistent expression in Christianity.

So soon as it comes to be recognized that the relation between the two is close, it becomes important to study afresh the connexion between them in its first stages. The last twenty years have witnessed a great increase in the study of Christian beginnings by those who approach the matter from the side of the classical tradition, so great an increase in fact that the study may almost be looked upon as new. Those who are interested primarily in theological literature are bound to recognize the value of these studies, which is all the greater as it is undertaken

by men trained in other fields. They bring with them a different standard of evidence, which has all the advantage of being different, though it may not necessarily be better. The contributions of Blass and Norden to questions of text and style, or the literary studies of Reitzenstein and Geffcken may serve as illustrations. These writers are apt still to regard themselves as straying outside the limits within which they might be expected to keep: they excuse themselves from discussing problems of a certain kind, for fear of entering what they describe half ironically as the province of the theologians: but yet the very fact that they engage on this study serves in itself to bring the philologist and the theologian nearer together. The theologian at any rate cannot complain if the recognition of Christian literature as belonging to the classical tradition, after being so long delayed, is at last being effected.

The questions under this head which affect Clement are mainly two: the source of his information and the position which he occupies as a philosopher. Neither of these problems is a new one, but both of them have recently been investigated in rather a new way.

The question as to Clement's sources is related to the question of his originality, but the two have often been connected too closely. The older view of Clement, which has lasted from near his own time to a comparatively recent period, is that his erudition was enormous. Even a cursory study of Stählin's notes suggests that the number of authors with whom his writings shew connexion is very large. Whether his admirers would ever have committed themselves to the belief that every one of Clement's quotations or allusions means first-hand acquaintance by him with the passage quoted and with its original context, is perhaps doubtful: but at any rate they would have affirmed this in regard to the bulk of them. In the last forty years scholars have become suspicious, and their temptation has been to suggest of all of these quotations that they are derived from handbooks, and to believe that none of them imply acquaintance with the original author. It is probable that most of these critics would

in their turn not wish that this principle should be applied equally everywhere: few of them deny to Clement, for instance, a first-hand knowledge of Plato. But they have been tempted to apply the hypothesis of unintelligent borrowing rather freely, and to adopt theories dependent on it, such as the almost incredible view which Wendland at one time maintained, by which he made Clement copy a passage in Musonius so carelessly as to seem to refer to another work by Musonius as though it were a work by Clement himself. Such exaggerations are natural and probably inevitable. But it is important to recognize that this question as to Clement's habit of borrowing is a different one from any question as to his own originality. The history of the classical tradition can only gain from the minute study of Clement's writings which such hypotheses imply. In particular much is to be learned from the comparison of Clement's materials with those of writers like Aelian, Athenaeus, or Diogenes Laertius. The elaborate and patient discussion of this subject by Dr. Gabriellsson has not only raised to a high degree of probability his main thesis that Clement is very frequently dependent on Favorinus: it has also made clear by the way how closely connected the text of Clement is with that of these other authors, and, as the work of Favorinus is lost, the fact of the connexion is after all of greater importance to us than the name of the author to whom the connexion is due. Such discussions are valuable in every way: valuable as bringing Clement into close relation with non-Christian writers, and valuable also as making the contributions to be gained from his works more accessible for the classical scholar. Even however if it were supposed (what Dr. Gabriellsson for instance does not suppose) that the whole of Clement's learned material comes from Favorinus or from authors of similar handbooks, Clement's originality is not much affected. After all his originality did not consist in inventing these allusions: if anyone had indulged in so extravagant an hypothesis as to hold that the lists of names or opinions in which his works abound were mere inventions intended to impose on a



wholly ignorant public, the discovery of so much common material elsewhere would have done Clement the service of shewing that this is not true. If a modern author makes use of the work of another without acknowledgement we are inclined, when the omission seems not to be due to mere forgetfulness, to condemn him, at least for a lack of courtesy, and possibly for plagiarism. But this plagiarism, however extensive, does not necessarily affect his claim to originality, unless the plagiarism be on the very point which forms the foundation of such a claim. He ought not to have adopted without acknowledgement the work of another ; but unless his predecessor had actually anticipated him in his new discovery, he becomes neither more nor less original whether he does or does not mention the help which he has derived from the other. An ancient author had not the same opportunity for explaining his intellectual debts. He may no doubt make a general mention of his obligations, but such a procedure as would involve the insertion in the text of all that in the present day would be put into notes must have rendered his work quite unreadable. It is therefore admitted that we have to be careful before applying modern standards of plagiarism to an ancient author. If the text of Clement had been like the text of Buckle's *History of Civilization* with the notes worked into the text, the writings of Clement would have been still more difficult than they are and we should not have been grateful to him in a literary sense. Yet even if he had proceeded in this way and the material which he thus provided had convinced us of his dependence for all particulars on some predecessor, he would still have remained the first, so far as our information goes, to make the evidence of non-Christian literature available for Christian purposes. It is here that his originality is to be found. There is consequently no cause for jealousy lest these modern inquiries into Clement's sources should impair his originality. Nor is there any justification for the belief that the result will be to show an inferior standard of learning or of literary honesty in Clement than in his non-Christian contemporaries. Maximus of Tyre, whom

Mr. Tollinton very properly selects as one of six contemporaries for comparison with Clement, certainly does not reveal a higher level ; and it is the age of Maximus with which we have to do, not that of Aristotle.

The cognate question as to the position which Clement occupies as a philosopher has also been complicated by a controversy as to his originality. The matter is not decided if Clement is described as an eclectic. All philosophers of his day tended towards eclecticism, and the barriers between the various schools were often broken down : a man might claim to be original if he combined Platonic and Stoic tenets in new proportions, even though he might have contributed nothing himself except such slight framework as is necessary to shew that the different parts of his system, none of them new in themselves, were not obviously incompatible. It is reasonable too to speak of an eclectic school of philosophers, though the line may be hard to draw between the members of such a school and the unorthodox members of the recognized schools. Such a period as the Second century is certainly not one when, if we are using the term 'original' so as to cover any considerable number of philosophers, we can afford to confine it to those who could point to definite opinions on particular points in which they had never been anticipated. It would seem that the same is really the case with other periods in the history of philosophy. There is something to be said for the limitation of the word 'original' in such a way that it is used only for the very small class of men whose views are so independent that they have convinced all their successors of the importance, if not the truth, of what they have to say. But this is not the common use of the word. If we refer to a philosopher as being unoriginal, at any rate if we use the term in a disparaging sense, we do not mean that he is not in the same rank as Plato or Kant. We mean that his point of view as a whole, or at least as regards all its most important and distinctive component parts, has been anticipated by another, and that the arguments by which he defends them have in the main been anticipated also. It is a question of degree ;

but it seems likely that, if he developed a traditional position on new lines, we should not refuse him the merit of originality, and still more probable that, if he employed the philosophical position of the school to which he belonged in a new connexion, we should allow him the epithet. A modern philosophical 'apologist' for Christianity may afford an example. If he endeavoured to shew that a Christian belief was consistent with or was the logical outcome of a particular system, whether Hegelian or pragmatist or Bergsonian or of any other kind, he might be granted a certain originality, even though he had contributed nothing to the development of the system on points of philosophical detail. In this sense Clement can fairly claim originality. He was not the first to make use of philosophy for the purposes of Christianity. He had been preceded by Justin and Athenagoras, even if we leave the New Testament writers on one side. In certain respects he may, as we have already seen, be classed with the Second century apologists. But, if he is correctly described as an apologist, it has to be added that he is an apologist, not only in the sense that he makes answer for his faith, but still more in the sense that he asks from his opponents an answer for their lack of faith. As a philosopher he contends that faith is required as a support of knowledge, he argues that this is in fact the position of the philosophers, and that there is no ground for hesitation in accepting Christianity because it too insists on faith. Christianity he holds to be the completion of philosophy and that which makes philosophy intelligible. Here he is a pioneer, and the inquiries into his philosophical antecedents cannot rob him of the credit, whatever their result may be.

It does not follow that these inquiries are not valuable in themselves. When we remember that the name of Clement does not occur in the index to Zeller's volume on the Eclectics, it is at any rate a gain that he should be taken seriously as a philosopher. In this respect the studies of Verkuyll on Clement's psychology and of Scherer on his epistemology are more important than the earlier works of Ernesti and Capitaine on Clement's ethics,

because they deal with more fundamental philosophical problems. The attempt of Daskalakis to assign the various details of Clement's philosophical material to the schools to which they severally belong has a similar importance. But here it would seem that the literary question as to the eighth book of the *Stromateis* (to which we have already alluded) has to be decided first. Miss de Wedel argues that the work from which that book was extracted (as also the other two sets of extracts that follow it) was neither purely Stoic nor purely Peripatetic, but had already effected a fusion between these elements, with the possible addition of others. Now, if these extracts represent fragments of Clement's own work, though possibly in a rough or preliminary form, it might seem as though he had taken his philosophical material, in the same way as he is now generally held to have taken his lists of inventors or authorities, from an earlier manual, and may not have developed them in any way but only have used them for a Christian purpose. If, however, Ernst is considered to have proved his point and to have shewn that practically all of the material which has reached us under the name of the eighth book of the *Stromateis* is used up by Clement in earlier books, with just enough modification to shew that he has treated it independently, we may, while still recognizing the advantage of the accident which enables us to trace back parts of the fusion at least one stage behind Clement, yet admit the probability that Clement advanced that fusion further himself. The reputation of Clement will not depend appreciably on the result of this inquiry : for, even if he be decided not to be original as an eclectic, he would remain original in his use of eclectic material. The inquiry is rather one of those which help to put him in his proper context in relation to his philosophical predecessors and contemporaries, and to assist in the unravelling of the tangled history of Second-century philosophy, which all recent study has shewn to be an even more complicated matter than used to be supposed.



## V

It will appear to the general reader, who is not specially interested in the history of scholarship or of philosophy or in the details of New Testament criticism, that all these matters are preliminary, and that it is at least an open question whether it is worth while, except for minute specialists, to spend so much time and energy on the discussion of problems, some of them possibly insoluble, all of them suggesting other problems in their turn. Such discussion may be held only to be justifiable if applied to an author of the first importance, whose value can be established on general grounds and is not due to a false inference from the fact that scholars have devoted much attention to him and have gradually deluded themselves in consequence.

It is never possible, either to say what branches of study will or will not prove ultimately useful, or to limit legitimate work on principle to the former class. It is a commonplace to say that any attempt to confine a scholar to what he can shew to be useful would incur a grave danger of missing useful results. Studies which help to bring Clement into closer relation to his philosophical colleagues, or which utilize the evidence that can be extracted from his works in any possible direction, require no special justification. Yet it may still be contended fairly enough that grave injustice would be done to him if we were to allow ourselves to be confined to those subsidiary subjects and were to cease, in consequence of the great impulse given to them by the appearance of Stählin's edition and of numerous learned works, to attach importance to the matters on which Clement's reputation has previously depended. Mr. Tollinton has done a service in raising this question in a direct form by his sub-title, 'A Study in Christian Liberalism.' He desires to convince his readers that Clement has a permanent value for men of the present day, and that, however true may be the precept of Dr. Hort that 'we can learn to good effect from the Apostolic

Age only by studying its principles and ideals, not by copying its precepts,' there are yet special facts which make Clement's writings useful for us even in detail. It is evident also that Mr. Tollinton, though he is eminently judicious in his estimate, and represents fairly enough the dangers which a modern thinker might hold to be conspicuous in an Alexandrian type of Christianity, feels considerable sympathy with that type, as did Dr. Bigg before him. It would probably not be an unfair deduction from Mr. Tollinton's position (though here it is at least doubtful whether Dr. Bigg would have agreed) that he looks on Clement as representing Alexandrianism in a more permanently valuable form than Origen. But 'Alexandrianism' is after all an ambiguous term, hardly less than 'Christian liberalism.' It is desirable to try to get behind these terms, since many theologians would have no objections to describing themselves as in agreement with the Alexandrian Fathers, provided that they are allowed to introduce sufficient safeguards, and most moderns are prepared to appear as liberals if the definition of liberalism is left to themselves. It is worth while to inquire what the particular qualities are in respect of which Clement is alleged to have so much to teach us.

The tendency to assign a special prominence to Clement in considering the parallels between the early ages of Christianity and more modern times is, as Mr. Tollinton reminds us, not new : he is able to cite similar words of appreciation for the help which can be derived from the writings of Clement, out of the works of several very different authors. This consensus is enough in itself to challenge our serious attention : the more so as the impression is necessarily derived from Clement's writings only, without any extraneous assistance from the events of his life. The writings of Origen, Athanasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret (the list might be extended almost indefinitely) owe a great deal to the known facts of their authors' lives. Forgetfulness of the course of Augustine's life seems to be one of the most fruitful sources of those one-sided judgements to which estimates of Augustine's writings lend themselves. It is

difficult to feel sure what our opinion would be of any of these authors if we can imagine ourselves as forming that opinion without any knowledge of their careers. The student of Clement is almost in the position of knowing nothing apart from his writings: what little is known from outside does not do much either to stimulate the imagination or even to supply details. The fact that the impression of Clement's usefulness for modern days is derived from the writings alone is in itself a considerable tribute to those writings.

The general attitude of Clement towards philosophy is such that few are under any temptation to criticize it. Philosophy represented for the Second century the culminating point of all the knowledge and all the culture of the time. In order to picture to ourselves what philosophy meant to a thinking man of that period, we must pass outside the narrower limits which increasing specialization, together with a certain amount of misapprehension, has set to the term 'philosophy' as it is now commonly used. The question for a Second-century Christian was whether Christianity was or was not to remain alien to the whole of Greek traditional culture: or perhaps it should rather be put as a doubt whether, now that the speculations of the Gnostics had definitely raised the question of their relation, Christianity was or was not to establish itself as alien to that culture by answering the doubt in a negative sense. Tertullian has often been contrasted with Clement as a striking example of the opposite point of view. His attitude, possibly strengthened in his later years, certainly not weakened, by his Montanist sympathies, was one of rejection. Philosophy is for him the source of heresy and doubt: the reason to which he trusts for the acceptance of his subtle arguments is ultimately itself distrusted. It is natural to feel a leaning towards a man who has formed the subject of so many unmeasured attacks, some of them ignorant, as Tertullian, and impossible not to wish to abstain from a final judgement in the case of one whose real mind is far more difficult to understand than Clement's: yet it can hardly be doubted

that Tertullian was in this question on the wrong side and Clement on the right. It is clear that Clement found many to feel doubts about his attitude: his reply to these doubters, characterized by much patience, much serious argument, and only very seldom by the less effective weapon of irony, increases respect for his own position. He felt that Christianity could be justified as the highest of all philosophies and that therefore all the writings of the philosophers, and not of the philosophers only, must be treated not as alien but as stages on the way towards the fuller knowledge of God. There might be many simple Christians who could not reach the higher level of philosophy and would have to be content with something simpler; but the simpler faith rested for its ultimate justification on that philosophical truth, a part of which had been reached by Plato and the other heroes of philosophical speculation. Christianity is that for which the philosophers have been seeking: the Christian can put his belief before them as that of which they have need, and, in a different but also a real sense, he can be said to have need of philosophy.

It follows from this attitude that Clement is very sympathetic, wherever he can be, with all those outside: he is always anxious to accept all that he can, he is inclusive rather than exclusive. It would be alien from his whole conception intentionally to misrepresent an opponent: he has no wish for an easy logical victory. It must be added that his attitude to philosophy is not accompanied by any compromise in essentials, either on the side of intellect or of emotion. He does not give up parts of the Christian faith which the philosopher might have found it difficult to accept, in exchange for the support of the philosopher elsewhere. In regard to the Gnostic writers we are under the disadvantage of knowing them almost entirely from their opponents; and some of those opponents may not have been scrupulously fair in their reproduction of Gnostic arguments, while others may have failed to understand them. It certainly looks, however, as though some of the Gnostics, though they may have approached these questions originally from the Christian side, were



ready enough to throw over large parts of Christianity. There can be no such suspicion about Clement. Whatever point he may be discussing, and however great his obligations may occasionally be to non-Christian writers, he remains fundamentally Christian.

These are great and striking merits. Any modern Christian who finds himself in the position of having to consider a new scientific discovery or a fresh philosophical formula may well aspire to undertake the consideration in the broad-minded spirit which comes so naturally to Clement. In so far as it is the duty of the 'Christian liberal' to be continually considering fresh problems as they arise and to be defending new adaptations in the stage when they are still regarded as paradoxical and have not yet become truisms, the example of so large and comprehensive a scheme as that of Clement cannot but be full of encouragement. There are some even in these days who regard the early ages of the Church as times of stagnation rather than of development: for them it must be useful to be reminded that, if we turn to the Fourth century for suggestions how to treat complicated problems of practical organization or of the relation between the Church and other social elements, it is the Alexandrians of an earlier date who teach most about the methods of facing intellectual difficulties.

There is however a tendency to press the conception of Clement as a liberal in certain ways which lead us in directions where we have to be careful. His relation to the institutional element in religion illustrates one of these directions. It is not hard to find passages in Clement where he speaks as though institutions were of secondary importance. The 'Gnostic' is the true priest; he has passed beyond purifications and liturgical forms; he understands the real hidden meaning of the fast days. Every righteous meal may be lifted to the level of a Eucharist. Before we draw inferences from such passages, we do well to bear in mind that Clement also lays stress on the duty of public worship, of the reading of Scripture, of prayer, almsgiving, fasting, the Eucharist. If anyone were inclined

to imagine that Clement proposes to substitute something else for the regular rules of the Church, he could only maintain his position by ignoring many plain passages that tell on the other side. Nor would it be true to say that the institutions are conceived as appropriate to the simple believer, and something deeper for the 'Gnostic': the 'Gnostic' is not less regular but more regular than his simpler brother in obedience to the rules of the Church. There is no inconsistency here, though some misconception is frequently found on this point. It does not follow, because a theologian draws new lessons from existing religious institutions or uses for a new purpose metaphorical language derived from those institutions, that he undervalues the institutions themselves. It might be possible for him to use such language, though he had no belief in the importance of the institutions: but he could adopt the language at least with equal justification, if he did believe in them. If he both uses such language and also dwells on the importance of the institutions themselves, he affords no precedent for those who would do the former without the latter. Any inferences which can be drawn from the position of Clement in this matter can only lead to the conclusion (which has probably not often been seriously questioned) that a Christian may attach importance to the regular observance of the rules of the Church and may at the same time draw new lessons from those rules. The result remains substantially the same if we consider the frequency of Clement's references to such institutions. It is true enough that there are other early Christian writers who contain many more allusions to the rules of the Church in proportion to the number of existing pages of their writings. But, though the bulk of Clement's existing writings is large, the proportion of it in which detailed allusions to institutions might be expected to be frequent is small. It is always a hazardous proceeding to argue from silence and to insist that an author must have said something in a given place, had he believed in it or in its importance: it would not be easy to find many places in Clement where another writer more institutionally-

minded would have been able to introduce allusions to the importance of ecclesiastical use without giving way to an irrelevance far exceeding what is commonly and not always unjustly laid to Clement's charge.

Another characteristic of Clement requires to be noticed in this connexion. He is very reluctant to commit himself definitely, beyond what the immediate needs of his argument require. An unfavourable critic would say that he does not think things out or press them to their logical conclusion : the more favourable way of putting the same point would be to say that he does not wish to hamper his belief or his intellectual position by dogmatic statement with which he can dispense. However it is stated, it is true that, on many points, Clement's views can only be followed to a certain distance : a conclusion seems to be bound to follow, but it is never explicitly drawn, and it remains doubtful whether Clement drew it himself or not. Another consequence is that different statements by Clement seem to be leading in opposite directions : the reader feels that, while they may perhaps be defended as complementary aspects of the same truth, we are entitled to demand at least a recognition by the author that they are superficially in need of explanation. The statements do not go quite far enough to be actually contradictory ; it is possible that Clement thinks that they have reached the limit of profitable speculation and that the attempt to harmonize them at a further point can only result in a formula which is intellectually unsatisfying, but it is also possible that Clement may not himself have been aware of the existence of the problem. We are hardly in a position to decide between these two explanations : it is certainly the fact that we are often finding ourselves in the presence of opinions which seem to call for further comment, and do not receive it.

In a well-known passage of the fifth book of the *Stromateis*, Clement explains how the method of 'analysis' is the only one available in order to arrive at the nature of God, and that the result is to shew us that we can only know what God is not. This is, as Dr. Bigg has pointed out, 'essentially a heathen conception, and can be developed

consistently only on heathen principles.' But no such development occurs in Clement. It is clear enough that God is to Clement the Christian Father, who stands in intimate personal relation to all men, so far as their defects do not impede this relationship. Clement can even speak of a natural knowledge of God which can be found in all men. Such knowledge can hardly be the negative knowledge of which alone philosophical analysis renders us capable: even if Clement had been prepared to allow to all men the capacity for such speculation, the results of this speculation are not what is wanted. It would be rash to assert that no reconciliation can be effected between the abstract God of pure metaphysics and the personal God of the Christian consciousness: many theologians have attempted such a reconciliation and, if charged with inconsistency, have sometimes argued that they are at least as consistent as the holder of any other theory can be on this level. But we notice that Clement, while he tells us that our philosophical knowledge leads only to negative results as regards the nature of God, and at the same time that God is in the closest relation to us and in a relation which is quite unintelligible if not stated in positive terms, does not discuss or even appear to be conscious of the difficulty which his position suggests.

No doubt it might be evaded in various ways. It might for instance be contended that the apprehension of God is dependent on some other faculty than knowledge. The difficulties raised by this conception need not be discussed: for, whatever affinities of other kinds there may be between Clement's language and mysticism, there is no trace in him of any stage above reason and knowledge.

It might be thought that, whatever is lost through the exclusively philosophical approach to the nature of God the Father, might be restored through the Son. There are few subjects on which Clement is fonder of insisting than the part played by the Logos in the education of the world, whether through the Scriptures or through philosophy. But this alternative would entail two consequences, and Clement would not be prepared for either of them. One



result would be to separate the spheres of faith and of knowledge, and Clement holds them to be indissolubly united. Another result would be to introduce some difference between the nature of the Father and the Son, and, though later writers took occasion to criticize part of Clement's language in the light of the technical terminology which was subsequently fixed, there can be no question that he means to assert the essential unity of the Father and the Son. So far in fact does this insistence on their unity go, that, although Clement appears to agree with Philo in his conception of the relation of the Logos to the world, he has been accused (for instance, by Daskalakis) of referring all creation directly to the Father in such a way as to reduce the function of the Logos to nothing.

In these and many other questions it is much easier to object to inferences drawn from Clement's words than to draw a different inference for oneself. The expressions used about the human nature of Christ, though they certainly suggest differences from our own nature, cannot be described as docetic, since their main object appears to be to oppose docetism.<sup>1</sup> The distinction between God's intending and not preventing the suffering of Christ may not admit in the last resort of a philosophical defence, but Clement would have shrunk with horror from Dr. Bigg's suggestion that the result is 'to introduce dissensions into the counsels of the Most High.' The attempts which are made from time to time to explain Clement's language as involving something less than the doctrine of the Trinity or than the belief in the Atonement are unconvincing: he did not bring out in detail (and very probably had not fully thought out) the implications of either, but his expressions taken as a whole are less difficult when compared with the accepted views of a later date than when brought forcibly into harmony with rival theories. It has been truly pointed out that, though Clement may insist on the impossibility of understanding God, he yet requires for his argument against the Gnostic that Divine justice and mercy should be some-

<sup>1</sup> See the Rev. V. Ermoni in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, v. (1903) p. 124.

thing that we can interpret by what we know of those qualities: that he can reject the Stoic claim for human virtue to be like Divine virtue, and yet use language of his 'Gnostic' which comes near to apotheosis. He can dwell on the importance of not communicating all truth to the weaker brother and justify this procedure by an extensive citation of very various authorities, and yet leave his interpreters either doubting what it was that he did not wish to reveal or else asserting, as Dr. Bigg does, that 'in theology there was no secret at all.' He can describe the moral ideal as apathy, using a negative term which, whatever doubts there may be as to its exact implications, does at any rate suggest something less than the full life of Christian activity; and yet any interpretation of his meaning would be inadequate which failed to take account of the wide range of moral duty which he teaches and of the place of love at the upper end of the scale. He can speak of faith on many occasions, and endeavour on more than one occasion to explain its relation to knowledge: while yet he is so far from defining fully the meaning which he attaches to the term as to leave the reader in considerable doubt whether he agrees with the argument or not.

These are illustrations of that reluctance to go beyond a certain distance which is so baffling a quality in Clement. It is a very different thing from that fairness of mind which enables him to state various points of view and to maintain so accurate a balance between them as to leave the reader in doubt which is Clement's own. His account, for instance, of the advantages and difficulties of the married and the unmarried states respectively is so dispassionate that his commentators have not been able to agree which was Clement's own condition. Such detachment can only be regarded as a merit, but it is quite separate from the quality to which we are at present referring, though the two are not unrelated. Equally separable from it is that optimistic outlook on life which causes Clement to have attractions for so many various classes of readers. The belief in God's justice and goodness as ultimate postulates, the conviction that no intellectual difficulties can interfere

with this belief and the charity of mind to which it leads those who really feel it, are admirable qualities in themselves; their prominence in Clement make it hard to see how anyone can ever have doubted the fundamentally Christian character of Clement's conceptions; but the presence of an optimistic faith which cannot be shaken by the result of intellectual questions is a different matter from a reluctance to pursue intellectual questions beyond a certain point, which is as compatible with a defect of faith as with an excess. It is desirable to dwell upon this feature in Clement because there has been a paradoxical tendency in certain quarters to exalt Clement on the ground of his possessing a quality which, whatever may be said in explanation of it, is bound after all, so far as it goes, to be a defect.

It would be unreasonable to criticize Clement for not always seeing the difficulties which his position involves, and still more unreasonable to condemn him for occasionally using language which he might not have used if he had had those later difficulties prominently before his mind. Man cannot attain to complete knowledge; and a thinker can not only remain himself in an intellectual position which involves difficulties, but can also be of great value to others while so remaining. Yet the fact that his position is not completely thought out cannot in itself be treated as a merit. If Origen was led into maintaining positions which had to be condemned, and if we are bound to think that the condemnation, though accompanied by much folly and misunderstanding on the part of Origen's critics, was in certain respects justifiable, it does not follow that Clement is to be preferred to Origen because Clement failed to draw the conclusions from his own position. In one of the most suggestive parts of his admirable book, Dr. Bigg has developed a contrast between Alexandrianism and Augustinianism: he may be held to have shewn that Augustine is not more logical than Origen, but, whatever may be true of Origen, Clement seems to avoid these difficulties mainly through leaving them unexplained or even unmentioned. In this sense it is impossible to 'go

back' to Clement. Our admiration for Clement must rest upon his relation to his predecessors, not to his successors. No form of Christianity, whether liberal or otherwise, can afford to pretend that it has solved difficulties by ignoring them: to take Clement as a model, not for the many points which he tried to make clear, but for the many others which he failed to investigate to the end, is to do him grave injustice under cover of a compliment.

The article in the *Church Quarterly Review* for July 1904, to which reference has already been made, closes with a defence of Clement against the critics, mainly German, who are suspicious of him as being responsible for the hellenization of the Church. But these critics, though they maintain an unsatisfactory position, are following a correct instinct when they interpret Clement in the light of subsequent developments. Of course it would be unfair to hold Clement responsible for all that his successors said or did. Yet it is reasonable to point out that the course on which he entered was bound to lead in a given direction and to produce certain results, of which we may or may not approve. It is not possible to praise Clement both for entering on a certain course and also for not pursuing it beyond a certain point, unless it can be shewn that he had an intellectual justification for stopping where he did. Clement probably thought that he was endeavouring to answer every difficulty that presented itself: when, as often happens, those who live at a much later date are able to see that the difficulty is not felt, this is most naturally explained by the fact that Clement was no more omniscient than other men, and he would probably have been considerably surprised, if not offended, at being praised for deliberately evading or refusing to discuss difficulties of which he was aware. There is a certain superficial attractiveness in that 'Christian agnosticism' which contents itself with asserting only a few fundamental points and leaves all the rest on one side as comparatively unprofitable. But such a view, if it is to maintain itself at all, can only do so ultimately by fixing the limits between what can and what cannot



be known. There is little reason to expect that Christian agnosticism will be more successful than any other form of agnosticism in solving this problem, without discussing under slightly different names the questions which it asserts to be beyond discussion. And it would be a strange fate for Clement if he came to be regarded as a model for any kind of agnosticism.

P. V. M. BENECKE.

## ART. VI.—OLD LONDON CHURCHES BEFORE THE GREAT FIRE.

1. *A Survey of London, conteyning the originall, antiquity, increase and moderne estate and description of that city.* Written in the year 1598; since by the Author increased with divers rare Notes of Antiquity. London: 1602. By JOHN STOW. With Introduction and Notes by C. L. KINGSFORD. Two volumes. (Oxford: at the University Press. 1908.)
  2. *Ancient Funerall Monuments.* By JOHN WEEVER. (London. 1631.)
  3. *Camden Society Publications.* (London: for the Society 1838- .)
- And very many Tracts, Ballads etc.

### I

MANY of the Churches covered by this title were dealt with in the article which appeared in this Review in April 1915. It is proposed here to add notices of some which were omitted for lack of space and also materials which have since been collected.

The Gateway Arch in St. John's Lane, Clerkenwell, is all that is now left to us above ground of the Priory of the Knights Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem, to which it formed the southern entrance. The archway and gatehouse were for many years used as the Jerusalem Tavern

—not a very pleasurable form of reminiscence ; but in recent years the building has been acquired and used by a modern order of Knights of St. John, whose profession is more humanitarian than military and whose badge of the Red Cross is world-famous. The ancient Priory was dissolved in 1540. Lord Herbert of Cherbury in his *Life of Henry VIII* gives the following brief explanation and comment :

‘ It was enacted that the Lands and Goods of St. Johns in Jerusalem should be in the Kings disposition, for which these reasons chiefly were pretended. Because (they) drew yearly great sums of money out of the Kingdom ; that they maintained the usurped power of the Bishop of Rome ; that they defamed and slandered the King &c. . . . Nevertheless certain Pensions were allowed unto the Pryor and others. . . .

‘ And thus fell that Ancient and pious order not without much scandal abroad both to the King and Government.’<sup>1</sup>

No reverence was shewn for the buildings and we find in 1549 the Protector Somerset using the materials in the erection of his new Palace in the Strand that he did not live to complete :

‘ The steeple and most parts of the Church of St. John’s of Jerusalem, most beautifully built not long before by Dockwray, a later Prior thereof, was blown up with gunpowder and the stone thereof employed to that purpose.’<sup>2</sup>

But the destruction was not complete, for Machyn enters in his Diary :

‘ The XV day (March 1550) the Lady Mary rode through London unto St. Johns, her place.’<sup>3</sup>

and the chapel must have been left, since the same writer has an entry five years later, Mary then being Queen :

‘ The XXIX day of August 1555, the day of Decolacyon of St. John Baptyst, the Marchant Tayllers kept a masse at Saint

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Henry VIII*, 1649, p. 461.

<sup>2</sup> Peter Heylin, *Ecclesia Restaurata*, 1849, i 152.

<sup>3</sup> *Diary of H. Machyn* (Camden Soc.), p. 4.

Johnes beyond Smyt-feld . . . and after masse to the Tayllers' Halle to dener.' <sup>1</sup>

The Church now on the site dates from the Eighteenth century, and bears an inscription relating to its predecessor which reads 'Built c. 1130, completed 1185 by Heraclius Patriarch of Jerusalem.' It was burnt by rebels of Essex and Kent in 1381 and newly built by Docwra in 1504. A considerable portion of the ancient crypt remains and is in good preservation. There was an enlargement in the Thirteenth century by the addition of a beautiful Early-English chapel still in existence and used for services. The original Church, like others of the Templars, was circular: some slight traces of the stonework are still visible, and in the open space in front of the existing Church part of a circle of paving stones marks the position of the foundations of the wall of the Round Church. The tower was evidently conspicuous. Stow writes:

'The great Bell Tower, a most curious piece of workmanship, grauen, guilt and inameled to the great beautifying of the Cittie.' <sup>2</sup>

Queen Mary in her brief reign restored some of the religious houses, but another record shews us that her efforts were nullified on Elizabeth's accession:

'And those houses which had been either erected or else restored and repayred by Queene Mary; as the Priory of Saint John of Jerusalem . . . were agayne suppressed' (1559).<sup>3</sup>

We find that the chapel and other buildings were used under Queen Elizabeth for the 'Office of the Revels':

'The saied church or chapel and other buildings is converted and used by the said officers of the Toils and Tentes . . . and for other necessities.' <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Diary of H. Machyn* (Camden Soc.), p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> Stow, *Survey* (1603), p. 438.

<sup>3</sup> Sir John Hayward (1636), *Annals of the first 4 years of Queen Elizabeth* (1840), p. 28.

<sup>4</sup> 'Survey of the Hospital of St. John.' See Feuillerat, *Office of the Revels*, p. 47.

And indeed it had served a similar purpose under Henry VIII :

‘ A Store house for the King’s Toils and Tents for hunting.’<sup>1</sup>

Samuel Daniel in his *History of Henry III* has a passage worth citing inasmuch as it shews the status and authority of the head of a great religious house at the period (1252, 36 Henry III) :

‘ Boldly is he (the King) . . . reprooved by the Master of the Hospitall of Jerusalem in Clerkenwell who, comming to complain of an injury committed against their Charter, the King told him :

*‘ The Prelates, and especially the Templars and Hospitalers, had so many Liberties and Charters that their riches made them proud and their pride mad, and that those things which were unadvisedly granted were with discretion to be revoked.*

*‘ What say you Sir (sayd the Prior), God forbid so ill a word should proceed out of your mouth. So long as you observe justice you may be a King and as soon as you violate the same you shall leave to be a King.’*<sup>2</sup>

John Lydgate, usually known as ‘ the Monk of Bury,’ in a ballad-poem on Henry V, describes his marriage with Katherine of Valois at St. John’s, presumably this church. The banns were thrice published according to law :

‘ In the Chirch thries of Seint Johan  
Liche the custome of new and yore agon  
Thries published in open audience,  
As the lawe byndeth in sentence.’

Then came the wedding :

‘ But in his chirche than parochialle  
Of Seint Johan he came with good entent  
For to receive the holy sacrament  
Of mariage he and Katerine.’<sup>3</sup>

But if Lydgate is correct, and we must remember that he was living at the time, this must have been a duplication

<sup>1</sup> Newcourt, *Repertorium*, ad loc.

<sup>2</sup> 1613 (edition 1650, p. 168).

<sup>3</sup> T. Wright, *Political Poems and Songs*, II, pp. 136–37.



of the French nuptials, as the Chronicles say the marriage was at St. Peter's Church at Troyes on June 3, 1420. The earliest English life of Henry V, written in 1513, a translation of Titus Livius, confirms this.

The historian relates how on May 21 in the Cathedral Church at Trois the terms of peace were settled and how on June 3

'the Sacrement of Matrimonie was solemnely sacred betwixt the most victorious Kinge Henrie of Englande and that excellent and glorious Lady, Dame Katheryn, daughter to King Charles of Fraunce and to Dame Isabell the Queene.'<sup>1</sup>

Jordan Briset,<sup>2</sup> the founder of St. John's Priory in the Eleventh century, had previously founded a priory of nuns in the near vicinity. This was dedicated to St. Mary, and, being near the well, was called 'Ecclesia beatae Mariae de Fonte Clericorum.'

The Priory was occupied by Black Nuns of the Benedictine Order. The last prioress was Isabel Sackville, one of the Sackville family ancestors of the Earl of Dorset. On the ruins of the Priory was erected the Church of St. James, which Stow does not mention by name, though he has a brief allusion to Clerkenwell Church.

The old Church of St. James, Clerkenwell, was taken down in 1738, but drawings of it when in a state of ruin shew traces of a fine Gothic building with a tower. The spire was something of a byword :

'Nor can the lofty spire of Clerkenwell,  
Although he have the vantage of a Rocke,  
Pearch up more high his turning weather-cock.'<sup>3</sup>

Stow has it that 'the sayd Church tooke name of the well and the well tooke name of the Parish Clarkes who of old time were accustomed there yearely to assemble and to play some large hystorie of holy Scripture.'

In this Church were buried William Weston, the last

<sup>1</sup> (Clarendon Press, 1911), p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Stow, *Survey* (1603), p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> *Pasquils Palinodia* (1634), B 3.

Prior of St. John's, who died on the day of the dissolution of the Priory and did not live to enjoy the pension of £1000 a year allotted to him. Here also, by her own desire, was laid to rest Isabel Sackville, the last Prioress of St. Mary's. John Weever, the author of *Funeral Monuments*, was buried here in 1632, as was also at a later date Bishop Burnet.

## II

The Temple Church, like St. Bartholomew the Great a beautiful specimen of Norman Transition and Early Pointed architecture, receives but little notice in literature which indicates any feeling for its great artistic beauty. References mostly bear on the effigies of the Knights Templars in the Round Church which forms the entrance to the larger building. Stow, who in his list of Churches<sup>1</sup> calls this 'St. Parnell in the Temple'<sup>2</sup> for the use of Students there,' in another passage has:

'There remaineth monuments of noblemen buried to the number of 11; eight of them are images of armed knights, five lying crosse-legged as men vowed to the holy land. . . . The first was W. Marshal, the elder Earle of Pembroke who dyed 1219. . . . Wil. Marshal his sonne Earle of Pembroke was the second.'<sup>3</sup>

It was this elder Earl of Pembroke who was Regent during the minority of Henry III, and it was he who in Shakespeare's *King John* pleaded for the release of Prince

<sup>1</sup> *Survey* (1603), p. 496.

<sup>2</sup> In the *Paston Letters* 'Sen Pernelle' is mentioned, the name being, according to Dr. Gairdner's note, an abbreviation of Petronilla. This is a feminine diminutive of Peter, and the saint is said to have been a daughter of the Apostle. Alban Butler says 'This holy virgin shone as a bright star in the Church. She lived when Christians were more solicitous to live well than to write much.' Neither Newcourt in his *Repertorium* nor Hennessy in the *Novum Repertorium Parochiale Londinense* mentions 'Parnell' or Petronilla, and the Church is said to be dedicated to the Blessed Virgin Mary.

<sup>3</sup> *Survey*, p. 404. But according to a note in Kingsford's edition of Stow effigies of known Crusaders are found with legs uncrossed, and there are cross-legged effigies of knights who were not Crusaders.

Arthur at a time when the King believed that his instructions to have his nephew murdered had been carried out :

I . . . heartily request  
Th' enfranchisement of Arthur, whose restraint  
Doth move the murmuring lips of discontent

Why then your fears . . .  
. . . . . should move you to mew up  
Your tender kinsman, and to choak his dayes  
With barbarous ignorance and deny his youth  
The rich advantage of good exercise.'<sup>1</sup>

Seventeenth-century writers found these monuments useful as a simile, *e.g.* Sir Thomas Overbury has :

'The marble images in the Temple Church that lye crosse-legg'd, doe much resemble him saving that this is a little more crosse'<sup>2</sup>;

and Richard Brome in a play :

'I will rather die here in Ram Alley or walk down to the Temple and lay myself down alive in the old Synagogue, cross-legged among the monumentall knights there, till I turne marble with 'em.'<sup>3</sup>

Amongst many men of note buried in the Church in the Seventeenth century are James Howell, the author of the well-known *Familiar Letters* and Historiographer to King Charles II, who by his own wish was buried here on the north side of the Church : also

'That famous and learned antiquary Mr. John Selden, whose works are a monument far more worthy his memory than that in the Inner Temple Church,'<sup>4</sup>

of whom Ben Jonson wrote (referring to his book *Titles of Honour*, published in 1614) :

'Monarch in letters ! 'mong thy titles shown  
Of others' honours, thus enjoy thy own.'

<sup>1</sup> Act V, sc. II in 1623 ed.

<sup>2</sup> *Character of a Waterman*, a. 1613.

<sup>3</sup> *Mad Couple well matched* (1653), I, i.

<sup>4</sup> *Baker's Chronicle* continued by Phillip, p. 680.

Richard Hooker was Master in 1591. Fuller thus describes his preaching :

‘ His voice was low, stature little, gesture none at all, standing stone still in the pulpit, as if the posture of his body were the emblem of his mind, immoveable in his opinions.’

Hooker preached in the morning, and Mr. Travers, the afternoon preacher, used to controvert all that he had said. This caused Fuller to allude to the Temple of Solomon at the building of which we are told ‘ nor axe nor tool of iron was heard ’ :

‘ Whereas, alas, in the Temple not only much knocking was heard, but (which was the worst) the nailes and pins which one Master Builder drave in were driven out by the other.’<sup>1</sup>

Visitors to the Church may still see the Penitential Cell formed in the thickness of the wall. The ancient Chapel of St. Ann was on the south side of the ‘ Round ’ and opened upon the cloisters. Both have disappeared.

The following quotation from the Records shews some of the customs and regulations :

‘ A standing box bound with iron for contributions to the poor, prisoners and others to be set in the Church.

‘ A Butler of every House shall keep the Choir door, that no woman come into the Choir and they are to endeavour to keep out strangers except Noblemen and Knights.’<sup>2</sup>

The organ has always been famous. In 1685 there was a competition for its erection, and two organs, one by Bernard Smith and the other by Harris, were put up in the Church for comparison and selection. Finally, at a Parliament (the term used for a council of the Benchers),

‘ The Masters of the Bench declare unanimously that the organ made by Bernard Smith for sweetness and fulness of sound, besides the extraordinary stops, quarter notes and other rareties therein, is beyond comparison preferable to the organ made by Harris.’<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Church History* (1655), Bk. IX p. 216.

<sup>2</sup> *Calendar of Middle Temple Records*, Parliament, July 2, 1582.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* vol. iii, p. 1367.



So Bernard Smith erected his organ at the agreed cost of £1000, but an additional sum was asked for. Three years later we find some information as to the organist :

‘ Mr. Francis Pigott is appointed Organist for the Church, with a Salary of £50 yearly. . . . He shall find a blower at his own cost. Mr. Bernard Smith the maker of the Organ shall be retained to keep it in repair and tune at 20*l.* a year.’<sup>1</sup>

### III

The Church of St. Andrew, Holborn, stood opposite the Bishop of Ely’s Place. John Webster the poet was said to have been parish clerk of this Church (though latterly doubts have been thrown on the story), and Charles Lamb observed that ‘ the anxious recurrence to Church matters, sacrilege, tombstones, with the frequent introduction of dirges in his tragedies may be traced to his professional sympathies.’ In his *Devil’s Law Case* he has this passage :

‘ How then can any monument say  
Here rest these bones to the last day  
When Time, swift both of foot and feather,  
May bear them the Sexton knows not whither ?  
What care I then, tho’ my last sleep  
Be in the desert or in the deep ;  
No lamp, nor taper, day and night,  
To give my charnel chargeable light ?  
I have there like quantity of Ground  
And at the last day I shall be found.’<sup>2</sup>

The Parson of this Church got into trouble during the Interregnum. We read in the *Diurnall*, 1643 :

‘ A committee of the House of Commons for scandalous ministers sate this afternoon in debate . . . against Doctor Hacket Parson of Saint Andrews for divers misdemeanours alleadged against him in his superstitious Teachings.’<sup>3</sup>

He appears to have been deprived, but lived to be Bishop

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of Middle Temple Records*, Parliament, May 25, 1688.

<sup>2</sup> Webster, *The Devil’s Law Case*, 1623.

<sup>3</sup> *A Perfect Diurnall*, Sept. 11, 1643.

of Lichfield after the Restoration.<sup>1</sup> Bishop Stillingfleet was, according to Pepys, at one time minister here : ' the famous young Stillingfleet, whom I knew at Cambridge,' so Pepys wrote after hearing him preach at Whitehall (April 23, 1665). The famous Zwinglius was buried in this Church.<sup>2</sup>

The Church of St. Giles-in-the-Fields was newly built in Charles I's time, for Archbishop Laud consecrated it and has a note to that effect in his Diary.<sup>3</sup>

In the churchyard there is a monument to Richard Pendrell,

' Preserver and Conductor to his sacred Majesty King Charles the Second of Great Britain after his escape from Worcester fight 1651. Now to triumph in Heaven,'

so runs the epitaph,

' He is advanced for his just steerage here.' <sup>4</sup>

In the Church there is a memorial with an eloquent epitaph to Andrew Marvell; who certainly would not have assisted Charles to escape, but who, although a political enemy of his father, wrote the kindest words to his memory. There is also an altar-shaped monument, much weather-worn and now placed within the Church, to the honoured name of George Chapman the dramatist and translator of Homer.

There was formerly a hospital here and, according to Stow, prisoners on their way to Tyburn ' were presented with a great Bowle of Ale, thereof to drinke at theyr pleasure, as to be theyr last refreshing in this life.' <sup>5</sup>

Nash gives an old saw current in his time :

' A prouerbe it is as stale as sea-biefe, Save a thief from the

<sup>1</sup> He seems to have held the living of Cheam in Surrey with St. Andrew's. ' Holborn for wealth, Cheam for health ' is what he was told.

<sup>2</sup> See *Zurich Letters*.

<sup>3</sup> Jan. 23, 1630-1.

<sup>4</sup> For a further account see Blount's *Boscobel* (1660).

<sup>5</sup> Stow, *Survey* (1603), p. 444.

gallows and hee'le be the first shall shew thee the way to Saint Gilesesse.' <sup>1</sup>

In the Marriage Register for 1654 there is this entry :

' William Temple Esq<sup>r</sup>. and Mr<sup>s</sup> Dorotheie Osborne had their intension of marriage entered the ninth of this month and were thrice published. They were married on Christmas Day.' <sup>2</sup>

St. Martin-in-the-Fields near Charing Cross was the proper place for the registration of the births of any Royal Children born at Whitehall, but Fuller in his *Worthies* writes :

' I am credibly informed that at the birth of every child of the King, born at Whitehall or Saint James's, full five pounds were faithfully paid to some unfaithful receivers thereof to record the names of such children in the Register of Saint Martin's. But the money being embesiled (we know by some, God knows by whom) no mention is entered of them.' <sup>3</sup>

Evelyn in his Diary has an entry shewing that the right of sanctuary was still in force in the late Seventeenth century :

' Good Friday. Dr. Tenison preached at St. Martin's. During the service a man came into near the middle of the Church, with his sword drawn, with several others in that posture ; in this jealous time it put the congregation into great confusion ; but it appeared to be one who fled for sanctuary being pursued by bailiffs.' <sup>4</sup>

The Churchwardens' accounts of this Church have an entry shewing that plays were performed here in Henry VIII's reign.

' It'm resceyued of the players that played in the Churche ijs.' <sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> 1593. *Christ's Teares over Jerusalem.* Works (1910), ii 180.

<sup>2</sup> *Letters of Dorothy Osborne.*

<sup>3</sup> Fuller's *Worthies* (1662), Westminster, p. 240.

<sup>4</sup> *Diary*, Mar. 25, 1687.

<sup>5</sup> *Churchwardens' Accounts*, 29 Hen. VIII.

Under the Commonwealth it was selected as a place for public penance :

‘Sara Wharton to be whipt at a carts taile about the streets and to do penance at Saint Martin’s Church.’<sup>1</sup>

The Church of St. Martin-le-grand had been destroyed with the Monastery in 1548—‘a Tavern built on the east part of it’—so Heylin writes. Touching on the question of sanctuary above mentioned, the following are interesting, the period being more than a hundred years before Evelyn wrote.

From Coke’s *Institutes* :

‘The Abbot of Westminster exhibited his Bill to the King against the Sheriffs of London for arresting and drawing out with force a privileged person out of the sanctuary of St. Martin’s le grand. The Sheriffs were grievously fined in the Star Chamber’ (29 Hen. VI).

From a letter of Thos. Dorset printed by the Camden Society :

‘Men sayd that the sayntuary shall aftr this setting of parliament, hold no man for dett, morder, nor felenye . . . nor Westmestre, nor St. Martyns etc.’ (1535).

#### IV

The Chapels Royal have frequent mention, sometimes in connexion with marriages or public functions but very often in connexion with the choir and the singers. The singing-boys or ‘Children of the Chapel’ were in much prominence for the purpose of play-actors before women were allowed on the stage, and in most of the early productions in Shakespeare’s time they took even the leading parts. For example, on the title-page of Ben Jonson’s *Poetaster* we read :

‘This comicall Satyre was first acted in the yeere 1600 By the then Children of Queene Elizabeth’s Chappell.’

<sup>1</sup> *Aulicus Coquinaria*, p. 107.



One of the 'Children,' a boy of thirteen named Salathiel Pavy, acted in the above play and Ben Jonson called him 'The stages iewell,' and when he died wrote his epitaph, by which it seems that the boy

' . . . did act (what now we mone)  
Old men so duely,  
As, sooth, the Parcae thought him one,  
He plai'd so truely.

' But being so much too good for earth,  
Heauen vowes to keepe him.' <sup>1</sup>

Some years earlier Peele's *Araygnment of Paris*, at the performance of which in 1584 Queen Elizabeth was present and was awarded the golden apple, was presented by the 'Children of the Chappell.' But in the second year of Charles I, when there was a growing prejudice against the stage altogether, we find public opinion revolted at the employment of children on the stage, and in the Patent granted to Dr. Giles, 'Master of the Children of the Chapel Royal,' we note these words :

' Provided always . . . that none of the said Choristers or Children of the Chappell . . . shalbe used or imployed as Comedians or Stage Players or to exercise or act any Stage plaies, Interludes, Comedies or Tragedies ; for that it is not fit or desent that such as should sing the praise of God Almighty should be trained or imployed in such lascivious and prophane exercises.' <sup>2</sup>

The old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal, Whitehall, has records of names of eminent organists and composers whose works are still in the repertoire of our Cathedrals. Amongst many others are :

' 1613. John Bull, doctor of Musicke, went beyond the seas without licence and was admitted into the Arch-duke's service.

' 1625. Mr. Orlando Gibbons, Organist, died.

' 1662. Mr. Henry Lawes, one of the Gentlemen of his Majesties Chappell-Royal and Clerke of the Check, died.

' 1664. Mr. Henry Purcell died.' <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Epigrams* (1616), cxx.    <sup>2</sup> Printed by Camden Soc.    <sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*

Leland describes the marriage of Frederick Count Palatine with the Princess Elizabeth, eldest daughter of James I.

‘Sunday 14th of February 1613 (St. Valentine’s Day) being appointed for this solemnity the Chappell of Whitehall was in Royall Sort adorned.’<sup>1</sup>

Archbishop Laud preached there on the day that King James died and notes in his Diary :

‘I ascended the pulpit much troubled, and in a very melancholy moment, the report then spreading that his Majesty King James, of most sacred memory to me, was dead. Being interrupted with the dolours of the Duke of Buckingham I broke off my sermon in the middle.’<sup>2</sup>

During the Civil War there was a long cessation of Church Music, and Pepys, who at the Restoration was a young man, notes in his Diary :

‘To Whitehall Chapel. . . . Here I heard very good musique, the first time that ever I remember to have heard the organs and singingmen in surplices in my life.’<sup>3</sup>

The little Church attached to the Savoy Palace, which is all that remains with us now, is still a ‘Chapel Royal.’ Thomas Fuller had the Lectureship there and his preaching is described by his biographer :

‘He had in his narrow Chappell two audiences, one without the pale, the other within the windows of that little Church . . . as if Bees had swarmed to his mellifluous discourse.’<sup>4</sup>

In 1644 the Savoy had become a hospital for the wounded, but we find in the Calendar of State Papers an order dated November 15 :

‘All who are able are to attend the daily reading of God’s Word and to go diligently every Lord’s Day and Fasting Day to the service at the Savoy Church on pain of fines.’<sup>5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Miscell. Pieces* (1770), II 330.

<sup>3</sup> *Diary*, July 8, 1660.

<sup>5</sup> *Domestic*, Charles I, p. 231.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary*, March 27, 1625.

<sup>4</sup> *Life* (1661), p. 14.

In earlier days it seemed a place for hasty weddings. In one of Dekker's plays it is said of an impatient couple

'They shall chop up the matter at the Savoy.'<sup>1</sup>

Near the Savoy was the Church of St. Mary-le-Strand. The demolition of the ancient church was one of the iniquities of the Protector Somerset in Edward VI's reign. Stow says of it :

'A Parrish Church called of the Natiuity of our Lady and the Innocents . . . pulled downe and made leuell ground in the year 1549. In place whereof he builded that large and goodly house now called Somerset House.'<sup>2</sup>

Sir John Hayward in his *Life of Edward VI* says :

'Many well disposed minds conceived a hard opinion of him for that a Church by Strand-Bridge and two Bishops' houses were pulled downe to make a seat for his new building.'<sup>3</sup>

The Chapel at Somerset House was specially rearranged for Queen Henrietta Maria who had legal permission for the use of the priests of her own religion and, as we find in *Baker's Chronicle* :

'The Papists also at this time (1637) suffered under a severe animadversion, it being observed that they made numerous resorts to private Conventicles at the houses of Forrein Ambassadors and especially to the old Chappell at Somerset House.'<sup>4</sup>

The Chapel of the Rolls, although in its later career it was used for secular purposes as the repository of State documents, should not be passed without brief notice. Originally attached to the House of the Converted Jews, it was, as Stow writes, in his time (1598) 'used and called the Chappell for the custodie of Rolles and Records of Chancerie.' But ten years after Stow wrote his *Survey of London* we find its ecclesiastical use was not abrogated :

'This morning about eight of the clock in the Chapel of the Rolls, Mr. William Cavendish, the Lord Cavendish his son, was

<sup>1</sup> *Shoemaker's Holiday* (1599), IV, v.    <sup>2</sup> *Survey* (1603), p. 447.

<sup>3</sup> (1636), p. 204.

<sup>4</sup> *Baker's Chron. Chas. I*, p. 502.

married to the Master of the Rolls his daughter, a young gentlewoman of thirteen years of age or thereabouts.’<sup>1</sup>

It was many years after this that Bishop Burnet wrote in his *History of his own Time* :

‘ I applied myself to my studies and my function, being the settled Preacher at the Rolls and soon after Lecturer at St. Clement’s.’

The old Chapel was pulled down when the new Public Record Office was built, and the Museum occupies its site, but traces of the old building, including the remains of a Gothic arch, may still be seen. A Church known as St. Thomas in the Liberty of the Rolls was built in the vicinity for parochial use. This was removed in the last century and a school built on the site in Bream’s Buildings, Chancery Lane. A small portion of the churchyard has been preserved and may be seen fronting the street on the north side. The inscription on one tombstone dated 1631 is unusually clear for the period :

‘ Here sleep our babes in silence,  
Heaven’s their rest  
For God takes soonest those He  
loveth best ’:

a perhaps unwitting adaptation of the classic ‘ Whom the gods love die young.’

## V

Some Churches in and near Cheapside may be briefly touched on.

St. Margaret Moyses or Moses, Friday Street, was so called (according to Stow) from the name of the founder.<sup>2</sup> John Rogers was vicar here and rector of St. Sepulchre in 1550. He was burnt as a heretic at Smithfield in 1555, the first burning in Queen Mary’s reign. He

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in *Life of Arabella Stuart* by Lefuse.

<sup>2</sup> ‘ The name may be due to *Moyes Sacerdos*, who occurs in Deeds in St. Paul’s about 1142.’ See note in Kingsford’s *Stow*.



edited a new version of the Bible known as Matthew's Bible,<sup>1</sup> a pseudonym used as a disguise. It was, in the main, Tyndale's version, and was authorized by Royal Licence while Tyndale's was forbidden by Act of Parliament in 1543.

In Bread Street was St. Mildred's. In Baker's *Chronicle* we find

'The 22nd Aug. 1485 . . . a great Fire was in Bread Street, in which was burnt the Parson of St. Mildred's and one other man in the Parsonage there.'

The Church which was destroyed in the Great Fire was on the west side, the existing Church is on the east, and harbours the parishioners of St. Margaret Moses, who are churchless.

On the north side of West-Chepe was the Chapel of St. Thomas Acon, which became on the Dissolution the property of the Mercers' Company. With the attached hall it was conspicuous in Cheapside, and is noticeable in old maps as a building of Gothic design. There were frequent references to services in the Chapel, and it was at one time used by Italians in London, as we read in a letter of Chamberlain :

'We are likely to have him [*i.e.* the Archbishop of Spalato] preach shortly in the Italian Church at Mercers' Chapel.'<sup>2</sup>

Spalato enjoyed a brief popularity. He was an impostor who pretended to be converted to the Anglican Church and received preferment. A ruse was adopted to get rid of him, and he was induced to believe that if he recanted his Protestantism he would be received at Rome with open arms and be promoted to a distinguished position, instead of which on his return to Italy he was handed over to the Inquisition.

Two Churches not far from the west end of Cheapside may be noticed in passing. St. John Zachary, the church-

<sup>1</sup> First edition 1537. A copy of the 1550 edition is now in the Church.

<sup>2</sup> July 5, 1617 (Camden Soc.).

yard of which now alone remains, was near St. Martin-le-Grand and the site of the Post Office recently pulled down. 'The Goldsmiths' Hall was in the parish, and Ralph Robinson the translator of More's *Utopia* was clerk to the Company and was buried in the Church in 1577.'<sup>1</sup>

Within a few yards still stands the rebuilt Church of St. Anne and St. Agnes, formerly known as St. Anne-in-the-Willows. A curious case is told in the Records shewing how easy it was in those times to become a heretic. I. Bowkyn was accused of heresy in 1493. It was alleged that he took hold of a lighted candle and said :

'As this candill doyth vaad and gooeth out, lykwyse my soole shall goo and assend to hevyn.'

St. Nicholas Cold Abbey, as rebuilt after the Fire, now fronts the modern Queen Victoria Street, but formerly was approached by Old Fish Street Hill. The following is from Wriothsley's *Chronicle* (1553) :

'Friday the 24 of November one Sir Tho. Sothwood, priest, alias parson Chekin of St. Nicholas olde Abbaye in olde Fische Street, rode aboute the Cittie in a carte with a ray hood for sellenge his wife, which he said he had married.'<sup>2</sup>

The prefix 'Sir' is a courtesy title often bestowed on the clergy, not, it would seem, appropriate in this case. A ray-hood probably meant a hood of striped cloth as a mark of opprobrium. The Chronicler alters the title 'colde' to 'olde.' Stow cannot suggest any explanation of 'colde' except a cold situation, like Cold Harbour not far off on the riverside.

The Church called St. John the Baptist-upon-Walbrook was opposite the Candlewick Street (now Cannon Street) end of Walbrook at the corner of Dowgate by Horseshew Bridge. It was apparently a Thirteenth-century Church, as it was enlarged in 1412 and 'new builded,' Stow says, in his time, 1598. It was burnt in the Great Fire. The State

<sup>1</sup> *Chronicles of the Parish*, 1914.

<sup>2</sup> Camden Society.

Papers have a reference to this Church shewing that, at all events in some cases, it was customary for parishioners to contribute to the needs of the poor and to hospitals, although not connected with their own Church :

‘September 11, 1573. The Treasurer of Christ’s Hospital acknowledges the receipt of certain sums collected in the Parish of St. John Walbrook for the relief of the Poor harboured in the Hospital. This was paid after reserving a certain sum for the poor of their own Parish.’<sup>1</sup>

Adjacent to the Church of the Augustine Friars, already mentioned,<sup>2</sup> was the Church of St. Peter-le-Poer in Broad Street, ‘sometime, peradventure a poor parish but at the present there be many fayre houses, possessed by rich marchants and other.’ So Stow writes, but he seems to be in error in attributing the name to the poverty of the parish. Fuller’s explanation is more likely to be correct, *viz.* that the name arose from the Augustinian Eremites who had

‘if not their first, their fairest habitation at St. Peters-the-poor, thence probably taking the denomination of Povertie (otherwise at this day one of the richest Parishes in the City).’

Thomas Lord Cromwell was one of the richest inhabitants and lived close by in Throgmorton Street. Stow tells of his high-handed action in pulling down his neighbours’ fences and annexing some of their land to his own use, Stow’s own father being a sufferer. Of Cromwell Fuller relates another incident :

‘Trayterous speeches were also charged upon him spoken in the Church of St. Peters-in-the-Poor (*sic*) ; the avouchers thereof pretending that as hitherto they had concealed them for love of themselves (fearing Cromwell’s greatnesse) so now for love of the King they revealed the same.’<sup>3</sup>

Robert Crowley the poet was at one time parson here. The Church, which was an ancient one, built in the Twelfth

<sup>1</sup> *Calendar of State Papers, Domestic, Elizabeth.* Addenda.

<sup>2</sup> In article in *C.Q.R.*, April 1915.

<sup>3</sup> Fuller’s *Church History* (1655), Bk. V. p. 232.

century or earlier, escaped the Great Fire, but according to Hennessy was rebuilt in 1791. It was taken down at the end of the last century. An old drawing shews a low, very poor building, with a large clock having gibbet-like supports built out from the Church.

Without the Bishop's Gate was another Church often mentioned in connexion with preachings. St. Mary-Spittle, by its name, kept up the memory of the dissolved hospital. Baker in his *Chronicle* writes of sermons in the reign of Edward IV :

'About this time also Richard Rawson, one of the Sheriffs of London, caused an house to be builded in the Churchyard of St. Mary's Hospitall without Bishopsgate where the Mayor and Aldermen used to sit and heare the sermon on Easter holydaies.'<sup>1</sup>

Stow writes of the Pulpit-Cross :

'A part of the large Church yeard pertaining to this Hospital . . . yet remaineth as of olde time with a Pulpit Crosse therein, somewhat like to that in Paul's Church yard. . . . The Maior with his brethren the Aldermen were accustomed to bee present in their Violets at Paule's on good Friday and in their Scarlets at the Spittle in the Holidayes, except Wednesday in violet.'<sup>2</sup>

Ben Jonson has an allusion to this in *Underwoods* :

'The French hood and scarlet gown  
The lady-mayoress passed in through the town  
Unto the Spittle Sermon.'

On the Sunday after Easter Day :

'The Children of Christ's Hospitall came from thence through the City to the Sermon kept at St. Mary Spittle all clothed in plunket coats with red caps and the maiden children in the same livery with kerchiefes.'<sup>3</sup>

During the Civil War the Cross was broken down, and after the Restoration the sermon was preached at St. Bride's and later at Christ Church.

<sup>1</sup> *Reign of Edward IV* (1643), p. 112.

<sup>2</sup> *Survey* (1603), pp. 168-69.

<sup>3</sup> Stow, *Summarie of Chronicles* (1598), p. 269.



The following shews how Richard III used the pulpit to influence the people in his favour :

‘ The Preachers in their severall places, the one at Paul’s Crosse, the other at Saint Maryes Spittle, (were directed) to exhort the hearts of the people to refuse the last King’s sonne (Edward the Fifth) and accept of the now Protector (Richard) to bee their King.’<sup>1</sup>

The original Church of St. Leonard, Shoreditch, dating from the Fourteenth or Fifteenth century, has given place to a modern building. Stow complains eloquently of the desecration of monuments in his time by a certain vicar

‘ for couetousnes of the brass which he conuerted into coyned siluer plucking up many plates fixed on the graves and left no memory of such as had been buried under them : a greate iniurie both to the living and the dead.’<sup>2</sup>

In the *Visitation of London* 1633-34-35<sup>3</sup> the Arms and Pedigree of James Burbage of St. Leonard’s, Shoreditch, are recited. He had two sons, Cuthbert and Richard. The latter is described as ‘ Richard Burbage the famous Actor on the Stage.’ This is a little surprising considering the violent antagonism displayed at the time to theatres and play-actors. It was James Burbage who built the first Play-house in London, known as ‘ The Theatre.’

Four Churches were dedicated to St. Botolph, all of them being close to gates, *viz.* Bishops-gate, Aldersgate, Aldgate and Billingsgate. The good Saint was an Anglo-Saxon of the Seventh century, who built a monastery at Boston, Lincolnshire : hence the name—Botolph’s Town.

Just outside the Bishop’s Gate is one of the Churches dedicated to St. Botolph, and we are reminded of Stephen Gosson, who was Rector there, and of Edward Alleyn, who was a parishioner. Thomas Fuller in his *Worthies* writes :

‘ Edward Allin was born in the aforesaid Parish near Devonshire House where now is the sign of the “ Pie.” He was the

<sup>1</sup> 1636. J. Trussel, *Continuation of S. Daniel’s Hist.* p. 222.

<sup>2</sup> *Survey of London* (1603), p. 429.

<sup>3</sup> Vol. i, p. 121.

Roscius of our age. . . . He got a very great Estate and in his old age . . . he made friends of his unrighteous Mammon . . . Building a fair College at Dulwich . . . for the relief of poor people. . . . The poor of his native Parish Saint Buttolph's Bishopsgate have a priviledge to be provided for therein before others.' <sup>1</sup>

In 1616 Stephen Gosson writes

'At my howse in Saint Botolphes Withoute Bishopsgate. To the worshipfull Edward Allen Esquire at his howse at Dulwich, give theis with speed. . . . I have now sente you a personale view of those three poore persons whose names were presented to you . . . trusting that uppon this enterview you will give them their direction when they shall be admitted unto your hospitale of poore folkes' (*i.e.* Dulwich College).

It is to be noted that Gosson, after being a writer of plays himself, wrote in his *School of Abuse* a diatribe against plays and playhouses. He is now asking a favour of Edward Alleyn who has expended the wealth acquired by theatres in the erection of his 'College of God's Guift' at Dulwich.

Sir Paul Pindar was a resident in this parish and the beautiful front of his house is now at South Kensington. He was moreover a liberal benefactor. In the Parish records December 22, 1634, there is an entry 'Given Sir Paule's cooke who brought the pastie 2s. 6d.' Sir Paul seems to have given the Venison for the pasty, as the entry continues: 'for flower, butter, pepper, egges, making and baking, as by bill, 19s. 7d.' Sir Paul was very popular and at his funeral in 1650 the crowd was great to see the coffin. The entry in the Record is 'Paid Mr. Ellis the glaisher for mendinge the windowes that were broken at Sir Paule Pinder's buriall 16s. 2d.'

A curious incident is said to have occurred at this Church in 1647. The story is told in a tract bearing the title

'Strange News from New-Gate or a true relation of the false Prophet that appeared in Buttolphs Church near Bishopsgate

<sup>1</sup> *Worthies of England* (1662), ii 223.

upon Sunday last in sermon time professing himself to be Christ.'

Of the Church at Aldersgate a strange story of sacrilege is told in the reign of Henry VIII :

' 1532.—This yere . . . the sacrement at Sent Butteles at Aldersgate on Good Fryday in the mornynge was stolne owte at the est wyndow and iij ostess wrappyd in a rede clothe and a woman browte it vnto the porter of the Gray freeres and she tane and broote vnto the shreffe.' <sup>1</sup>

A story is told of fanaticism in the second year of Queen Elizabeth :

' The 25 day (Aug. 1559) at St. Botolph's, Billingsgate, the Rood and the Images of Mary and John and of the Patron of that Church, were burnt with books of Superstition.' <sup>2</sup>

The Church of St. Botolph-without-Aldgate, situate as it was at so short a distance from the Tower, was used on more than one occasion as the burial-place of sufferers for real or alleged treason. Sir Nicholas Carew was one of such. Master of the Horse to Henry VIII, Knight of the Garter and well known as the Lord of Beddington in Surrey, where he entertained the King, he was convicted of treason as being concerned in the plot of the Marquess of Exeter. The Darcy family had a tomb in the old Church, and Sir Thomas Darcy, who was beheaded for being covertly connected with the insurgents of the Pilgrimage of Grace, was buried there. At the time of the Great Plague a large number of victims were buried in a pit in the churchyard.

Within a short distance to the east of Aldgate is White-chapel Church, dedicated to St. Mary Matfellow. The name has always been a source of conjecture. Stow tells a legend of the time of Henry VI and offers a suggestion. It seems that a Frenchman murdered a 'devout widow' and fled with her jewels to Southwark, where he took sanctuary and claimed the customary privilege. When

<sup>1</sup> *Chron. of the Grey Friars.* Rolls Series, *Monumenta Franciscana*, ii 195.

<sup>2</sup> Strype's *Reformation under Elizabeth*.

he was taken to Whitechapel by the constables the women of the parish

‘cast upon him so much filth and ordure of the streete that they slew him out of hand.’

And so from this felon-deed came the added name ‘Matfellow’—a solution of the difficulty which is hardly probable. Tennant says the name is from the Hebrew and signifies ‘Mary lately delivered of her holy Child.’<sup>1</sup> The old Church, which was a Chapel-of-ease to Stepney, was in such a bad condition in the time of Charles II that it was necessary to rebuild the whole, saving the steeple. On July 26, 1880, it was destroyed by fire, and the present fine building was then erected.

As to Stepney (anciently Stebunhith), Stow writes of the Parish Church that when the Priory of the Holy Trinity was suppressed, four of the greatest bells were sold to the parish of Stepney, the Church being one of six which, judging from a traditional nursery rhyme, were famous for their bells. After the Restoration the Church was the scene of a remarkable funeral. In a Tract of 1662 we read :

‘There was a numerous concourse (about 20,000) of sober, substantial people assembled to Christchurch to attend the corps [*i.e.* of Colonel Okey, one of the regicides who had been executed].’

Colonel Okey was hanged and quartered, but by permission of the King his relatives were allowed to bury his body by the side of his wife. He fought at Naseby but at a later date opposed Cromwell.

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Kingsford in his ed. of Stow has a note suggesting the usual custom of naming from a benefactor. He has discovered the name of a certain mercer called ‘Knapweed’ who died in 1341. The old-French for the common flower called ‘Knapweed’ is ‘Matrefillen’ or ‘Matfellow.’ It is on record that the parish was called ‘Villa beatae Mariae de Matfellow’ in 21 Richard II, if not earlier.



## VI

Recrossing London, on the outskirts to the north-west we find the little Church of St. Pancras situate not far from what is now King's Cross Station. The Church, originally Norman, was rebuilt in the last century. It is but little known or visited, and one might almost use the words of John Norden written in 1593 :

'Pancras Church standeth all alone as utterly forsaken, old and wetherbeaten . . . about this Church have bin manie buildings, now decaid, leaving poore Pancras without companie or comfort.' <sup>1</sup>

The Church was often alluded to and seemed to have a rather undesirable reputation. The parsons there were found to be 'convenient' in the way of weddings ; probably not asking too many questions. 'Thou Pancridge Parson' <sup>2</sup> used as a term of reproach in one of Field's plays shews this, and Middleton has :

'We were wedded by the hand of heaven  
Ere this work began' ;

to which the rejoinder is :

'at Pankridge,  
I'll lay my life on't.' <sup>3</sup>

In the next century duels were fought in the churchyard. So we may gather from Davenant's play :

'I told 'em of Pancras Church where their scholars  
(When they have killed one another in duel)  
Have a Church Yard to themselves for their death.' <sup>4</sup>

The old Ballad of Lord Lovell is about the same date as the play :

'Lady Nancy was laid in St. Pancras Church,  
Lord Lovel was laid in the choir,  
And out of her bosom there grew a red rose,  
And out of her lover's a briar.'

<sup>1</sup> J. Norden, *Speculum Brit.* (1593), pt. I 38.

<sup>2</sup> Field, *Woman a Weathercock* (1612), II i.

<sup>3</sup> Middleton and Rowley, *Fair Quarrel* (1617), V 1.

<sup>4</sup> a. 1660. *Playhouse to Let* (1673), I i.

## VII

We must cross London Bridge for three Churches all on the south side and close to the river. Foremost in importance is St. Mary Overie, otherwise known as St. Mary Saviour's or St. Saviour's, now a Cathedral and still one of the finest Churches in London, though the only really ancient portion remaining is the beautiful Early-English Lady Chapel. This has a certain resemblance to the Church of St. Faith-under-Paul's—Early-English ribbed vaulting supported by clustered columns. As Anthony Munday writes :

‘It is now called the new Chappell ; and indeed though very old, it now may be cal'd a new one because newly redeemed from such use and imployment as . . . may very well be branded with the stile of wretched, base and unworthy . . . by those that were then the Corporation . . . leased and let out, and the House of God made a Bake-house . . . the faire pillars were ordinary posts against which they piled billets and bavins . . . in this place they had their ovens ; in that their kneading troughs ; in another a hogs-trough.’<sup>1</sup>

Practically the whole of the Church except the Lady Chapel is modern, the work having been well carried out in the style of the Thirteenth-century Church. However, some traces of the original Norman Church can be seen, as may also some small arches of the Thirteenth-century Church. A small side chapel has been added, the gift of Harvard University.

The Church was not far from Bankside, which in the latter half of the Seventeenth century became famous for its playhouses and was the resort and in some cases the place of residence of many well-known playwrights and actors. From a letter of Bishop Gardiner we may see that even as early as 1547 there were plays of some kind on the Bankside. Gardiner, who it must be remembered was

<sup>1</sup> 1633. Munday's Continuation of Stow's *Survey*, p. 885.

Bishop of the Diocese, Winchester House being quite close to St. Mary's, wrote to Paget :

'To-morrow the Parishoners of this parish and I have agreed to have a solemn dirge for our late Sovereign Lord and Master, in earnest as beseemeth us, and to-morrow certain players, my Lord of Oxford's, as they say, intend . . . to have a solemn playe, to try who shall have most resort, they in game or I in earnest.' <sup>1</sup>

Seven years later Edward VI being dead, Gardiner, who had been imprisoned, was again at Winchester House and we read :

'They [*i.e.* Queen Mary and Philip] came from Richmonde by water to Southwarke. . . . The Kinge in one barge and she in another, and lande at Saincte Mary Overyes, at the Bushope of Winchester's place.' <sup>2</sup>

The bells of the Church had some reputation. Thomas Deloney writes (1598) :

'Me thinks these instruments sound lik the ring of S. Mary Overies belles, but the base drowns all the rest,' <sup>3</sup>

and Dekker about the same date has :

'Hark, they jingle in my pocket like S. Mary Overy's bells.' <sup>4</sup>

Camden records an Epitaph on one Jarret a Grocer :

'To Heaven he is gone, the way before,  
Where of Grocers there is many more.' <sup>5</sup>

Apropos of this and many other Epitaphs which often savour too much of panegyric and sycophancy it may not be out of place to quote one in St. Botolph's, Aldersgate :

'Praises on tombs are trifles vainly spent,  
A Man's good name is his best monument.'

<sup>1</sup> 1547. Rolls Series.

<sup>2</sup> *Chron. of Queen Mary* (edn. 1850), p. 78.

<sup>3</sup> Deloney, *Thomas of Reading*, chap. xi.

<sup>4</sup> *Shoemakers Holiday*, III i.

<sup>5</sup> Camden's *Remains* (1870), p. 436.

The monuments from the old Church have mostly been preserved and may be seen. Bishop Andrewes was buried there, also the dramatists John Fletcher and Philip Massinger, also Shakespeare's brother Edmund, and not least in fame John Gower the poet—the 'ancient Gower' as Shakespeare called him in the Prologue of 'Pericles,' if that play be his. Gower's tomb was in the north aisle of the old Church, but is now in the south. The old-French inscription ends

'Pur ta pité, Jesu, regarde,  
E met cest alme en sauve garde.'<sup>1</sup>

Stow says of him:

'John Gower was no knight, neither had he any garland of Iuie and Roses, but a Chaplet of four roses only.'

In a MS. of Gower's *Vox Clamantis* preserved in the Cotton Library, there is a portrait of him shooting with bow and arrow with the legend characteristic of the satirist

'Ad mundum mea jacula dumque sagitto.'<sup>2</sup>

The Church seems to have been known for its monuments, and the following, written near the end of the reign of Henry VIII, shews the growing dislike to images in Churches at that period—a dislike which in the next century became fanatic and led to the mutilation or destruction of much fine statuary and carved stonework:

'It is euydent also that thei teach men to worship imagys, for euery Church is ful and specyally Saint Mary Ouery in Sothwarke, of gylded imagys.'<sup>3</sup>

A curious story in connexion with this Church is told by Nathaniel Crouch who wrote under the pseudonym of Richard Burton:

'In the twentieth year of her [Q. Elizabeth's] reign a blazing star was seen with a long stream. About this time one Simon

<sup>1</sup> See Macaulay's ed. of Gower, I iv.

<sup>2</sup> In Strutt's *Antiquities*.

<sup>3</sup> c. 1541. Hen. Brinklow, *Complaynt of Roderyck Mors*. E.E.T.S., p. 61.



Pembroke of Southwark being supposed to be a conjuror, was ordered to appear in Saint Mary Overies Church, which he did and leaning against a Pew, the Proctor lifted up his head and found him dead . . . and being searched several devilish books of conjuration were found about him.'<sup>1</sup>

Brief mention may be made here of a church situated near to St. Mary Overy, *viz.* St. George the Martyr in the Borough of Southwark.

Anthony à Wood notes in his Diary that on the death of Oliver Cromwell

'his body was brought in the morning to St. George's Church in Southwark at which place at 12 of the clock his friends and many of the clergy and gentry met and accompanied it thence to Somerset House.'<sup>2</sup>

William Lilly, the astrologer, in his Life writes that he was married here in 1627 and 'for two whole years we kept it secret.'

Edmund Bonner, Bishop of London 1539, was buried here. He was deprived of his Bishopric by Henry VIII and imprisoned in the Marshalsea. He was restored to the See by Queen Mary but again deposed by Queen Elizabeth, and dying in prison in 1569 was buried in the churchyard at midnight with other prisoners. The old Church dated from the Twelfth century and formerly appertained to the Priory of Bermondsey. It was replaced by a modern church in the last century.

The Church of St. Mary, Lambeth, stands by the river adjoining the Palace of the Archbishop. The ancient Church to which the following allusions relate was the one rebuilt about 1375. The modern Church which replaced it in 1851 followed the lines of the old so far as was possible, and many of the monuments have been preserved. Some of the later Primates, including Archbishops Bancroft and Tenison, are buried here, as is also Cuthbert Tunstall Bishop of Durham, who was deprived by Edward VI, restored by Mary, and again deprived by Elizabeth. Thirleby, Bishop

<sup>1</sup> *Historical Remarques* (1681), p. 110.

<sup>2</sup> *Diary* (1656 Apr. 17).

of Ely, who was joined with Bonner in the proceedings against Cranmer, is also buried here. In the churchyard the Tradescant Monument is noticeable for curious designs, drawings of which are in the Pepysian Library, and have been reproduced in the *Bibliotheca Topographica*, vol. ii. Probably they were meant to be typical of Mr. Tradescant's famous collection now in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford. The Earl of Surrey's Epitaph on his 'faithful friend and follower' should not be forgotten :

'Norfolk sprung thee, Lambeth holds thee dead ;  
Clere of the Count of Cleremont.

. . . . .

Ah ! Clere ! if love had bootéd care or cost,  
Heaven had not won, nor earth so timely lost.' <sup>1</sup>

The small painting on glass in the south-east window of the Church of a Pedlar with his dog points to the idle tradition that he gave to the parish the ground called Pedlar's Acre, for permission to bury his dog in the churchyard. The story is no doubt a fiction, but the possession is a fact, as in the Churchwardens' accounts it is called Church Hope or Hoopys, and afterwards Church Oziers (being in the Marsh), and in 1505 produced a rent of 2s. 8d. per annum, which in 1651 had only increased to 4l. In 1690 it was termed 'Pedlar's Acre' in a lease. There has been recent litigation with regard to the Title, and the London County Council are now in possession and are building their new habitation on the site.<sup>2</sup>

An incident is related of Mary of Modena the unfortunate Queen of James II that, when hurriedly fleeing from Whitehall with her infant child, she was com-

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Clere was buried in the Howard Chapel. The family came from Clere-mont in Normandy, but Sir Robert Clere, the father of Thomas, lived at Ormesby in Norfolk. The fact that Thomas was page to Surrey is commemorated in the quaint English of 'Surrey for Lord thou chase' (= didst choose).

<sup>2</sup> See Dr. Ducarel, *History and Antiquities of the Parish of Lambeth* (1786), p. 30, and Edw. Hatton, *New View of London* (1708), ii 381.

pelled to find shelter from the storm at this Church until assistance and a carriage could be obtained.

### VIII

We conclude with the old Parish Church of Chelsea dedicated to St. Luke and situated close to the riverside.

The Church has a special interest in connexion with Sir Thomas More, who lived close by. William Roper in his *Biography* of his wife's father has :

' This good Duke of Norfolk comming on a tyme to Chelsey to dyne with Syr Thomas More, found him in the Church singing in the Quier with a Surplisse on his backe : . . . the Duke said : " God's body, my Lord Chancellour, what turned Parish Clarke. You dishonour the King and his office very much." ' <sup>1</sup>

Only a small portion of the ancient Church dating from about the Fourteenth century is left, *viz.* two or three Gothic arches in the choir, interesting as a reminiscence of the above incident, and a small portion of the north aisle. There is an epitaph on Sir Thomas More in Latin (his own composition). He had a vault in the Church, and there is a tradition that his body was removed there from the Tower.<sup>2</sup> His head is preserved at St. Dunstan's Church, Canterbury. More's Chapel was in his time his own freehold and not under the control of the Bishop. George Herbert's mother was buried here. Izaak Walton writes in his *Life of Herbert* that he ' saw and heard ' Dr. Donne ' weep and preach her Funeral Sermon.'

Here with reverent memories of Sir Thomas More and pleasant thoughts of George Herbert, Izaak Walton and Dr. Donne, it seems fitting to bring to a close allusions and *memorabilia* which but for the limits of space might be largely increased.

WILBERFORCE JENKINSON.

<sup>1</sup> a. 1578. W. Roper, *Life of More* (1626), p. 83.

<sup>2</sup> See Lysons' *Environs*.

## ART. VII.—THE CRISIS OF THE WAR.

1. *Political and Literary Essays*. Third Series. By the EARL OF CROMER. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1916.)
2. *An Introduction to the Study of International Relations*. By A. J. GRANT, ARTHUR GREENWOOD, J. D. I. HUGHES, P. H. KERR, and F. F. URQUHART. (London : Macmillan and Co. 1916.)
3. *The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey, 1906-1915*. By GILBERT MURRAY. (Oxford : At the Clarendon Press. 1915.)
4. *French Munition Workers' Sacrifices and Aims*. By M. ALBERT THOMAS. Delivered at the British Ministry of Munitions, October 6, 1915. Published by the Munitions Parliamentary Committee.

'THE war will end in June, so everyone says.' We read that remark in a letter not long ago, and it seemed to imply a dangerous state of mind. No doubt we all wish, and rightly wish, that the war could end ; but to translate that into an expectation which is not justified by the present condition of the contest might mean a disastrous weakening of our effort. There has been also a recrudescence of a very dangerous type of Peace movement, and it is difficult not to believe that the influence of hostile nations is being experienced. No doubt Germany longs for peace now—for peace which she thinks she will get on her own terms. But that would be something disastrous to the whole cause for which we are fighting. If we are not prepared to go on now, it would be almost better that we should never have begun.

Let us try to look at the situation as it appears from the German standpoint. We can imagine a representative of that nation speaking something as follows :

'Be quite clear ; we have been victorious in this war. Look at the map of Europe. We hold practically the whole of



Belgium, and some of the richest districts of France ; and for eighteen months you have been trying to dislodge us, and you have failed. Turn to the east and again you will see that all Poland, and a large portion of the Baltic Provinces of Russia, are in our hands. If you look to the south, Serbia, the cause of the present war, Serbia, the spoilt child of Russia and England and France, has been overrun by our armies, and has ceased to exist as a nation. What you thought was the decaying power of Turkey had the courage to join itself with us, and you know the result. Twice it has won great victories over your armies. We know that it need not have been so. We know that if you had shewn any capacity in making preparations, any power of carrying them out, if you had had either statesmen or generals, these things would not have happened. At Gallipoli you were very nearly winning, but you threw all your chances away. In Mesopotamia, what nation in the world but yours would have ventured to attack a people with a million men under arms with a single division ? You have paid the penalty for your folly and your rashness, and now the position of Turkey is stronger than it has been for many a year. Your newspapers try to conceal facts, and your statesmen hide their blunders, but soon the truth must become apparent even to your minds. Your Fleet came out, and thought that it would shatter our Navy ; but our Navy destroyed your finest cruisers and came back home in triumph.

‘ But perhaps you think that you are going now to make up for all this. We heard a great deal of the offensive that you were to make, but the offensive has been ours and not yours. During all these months it is we who have been attacking Verdun, and the French loss in men, which the estimate of experts reckons as at least twice as heavy as our own, frustrates the plan of an offensive to be begun at the same moment on all fronts. And while we were attacking Verdun we had not to withdraw any troops from your front ; and you learnt at Ypres what our offensive there meant. You thought Austria was worn out ; and Austria turned its armies upon Italy and drove it back from the mountains of the Trentino, which it had thought that it occupied as a permanent possession.

‘ But you think that the Russian offensive, at any rate, has achieved something. Yes ; we know quite well. It is not the first time that we have had to deal with the Russian offensive. We had to deal with one in East Prussia at the beginning of the war, and you know what happened when

Hindenburg concentrated his forces against it. We had to deal with another when the Russians were on the summits of the Carpathians, and again our armies were successful. In the spring of this year there was another attack, which was precipitated, against the advice of Polivanoff, by the feeling of brotherhood in arms ; and its miscarriage, after some successes, shews that the enemy in the east has not been able during the winter to learn any true lesson, and punctually repeats the mistakes for which he has so often had to pay the price before.

‘ But perhaps you think you are going to starve us out by your cruel blockade, which is contrary to all the dictates of international law. Do not flatter yourselves that you can do that. No doubt, life with us is uncomfortable. Our people have the proud knowledge that every man, woman and child is making a sacrifice for the Fatherland. We are pouring out munitions faster than other nations can ; we have abundance of supplies and all the material that is necessary, and if our people are deprived of many luxuries, and have to suffer, the soil of Germany is too well cultivated not to be able to support the nation. And besides, if you continue the war, we shall probably be reaping the harvest in the rich plains of Lombardy.

‘ Listen to what the Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs said the other day. It will shew you that Austria, like Germany, is prepared to endure till we have made a just peace—one which will give us some return for all the sacrifices that we have made.

‘ “ We were dragged into war by force and in self-defence. This we shall never forget. After our splendid victories our aim in the war is to strengthen and make lasting our safeguards against repetitions of such malicious attacks. We make no exaggerated demands, but these safeguards we shall forge hard in the fire of battle and our holy enthusiasm. Heaven alone knows how many hammer blows will still be necessary before we can rest on this new foundation for our Fatherland. In co-operation with her faithful allies Austria-Hungary will not stop on the toilsome road of the development of our heroic strength before the final victory is attained.

‘ “ As is well known, our enemies expect the turning point in the fortune of war to come from those great and united efforts which they have already prepared long since and from our exhaustion in all directions. We have done everything and will do everything without hesitation that is necessary for the frustration of their intentions, and, relying on God’s help, we

hope that these expectations of our enemies will meet with complete disappointment. By prolonging the war they can only cause more suffering, but they will not be able to arrest the iron tread of fate. The peaceful disposition of the Monarchy cannot be doubted, but, adopting Sir E. Grey's words of May 10, we also can say that Austria-Hungary and her comrades in arms cannot suffer a peace which would not make good the crime of this war." "

Something like this is what we can read almost any day in the German newspapers. There are few phrases in it which could not be justified, and let us be quite clear—if we were to make peace now, this would be true. Germany would be making peace on victorious conditions. And what would this peace mean? It would mean that Germany had really attained all that she desired, and that she would exist as a standing menace to this country. Let us again ask our German representative to expound his terms, and what they would mean.

' Do not think that we are going to be greedy in our acquisition of territory. Germany knows, in the hour of its triumph, how to be just and moderate. We did not begin the war, we did not desire the war, we have fought only for defence and for the freedom of nations, and we will shew it by the terms of peace. We do not wish to govern Belgium or France, and we shall be ready to give them back. You will of course give us back our colonies. That, we think, will be difficult for you English. If you are, as you pretend to be, faithful allies, fighting for the sake of other nations, you cannot refuse to do this. If you cling to these colonies of ours, which you have wrested from us by carrying war into Africa contrary to the very terms of the Congo Convention, then it will become clear to everybody that your aim was not the good of other nations, but your own jealousy of our colonial empire and commercial success. But if you do give them up to us, what of your own colonies? What will the people of South Africa say, who have shed their blood for the conquest of South-West Africa, and are now fighting in East Africa? What will they say if they find that all their efforts have been made, not for the good of their own country, but for the benefit of Belgium and France? They will learn in the future to ally themselves with the Power that can really

benefit its friends. What will Australia say when she finds us back again all round her borders? What will she think of the blood that she shed at Gallipoli, sacrificed to the incapacity of your statesmen and your generals, if the menace, as she puts it, of Germany in the Pacific remains the same? No; you will have to give us up the colonies you have torn from us, and then you will have alienated your own colonies.

‘And then on the eastern front. We have not embarked on any foolish aim of conquering Russia; we do not want to govern Poland; but what we want is that we Germans should be free for ever from the Russian menace of barbarism. We want to protect our frontier, and that we shall do, for we shall constitute once more a free Poland, and that country, which will owe its independence to our gift, will be a continuous barrier between us and the Russian hordes. Surely you cannot say that here we are not shewing moderation.

‘And then in the Balkan Peninsula and in Turkey. Our position there is not based upon conquest, but on the free help we have given to an oppressed people. No treaty of peace can destroy our position in Turkey, for we hold that, not by right of conquest, but because we have once more saved that nation from its enemies. Bulgaria was defrauded of its lawful gains in the second Balkan War, and we have given it back the country which rightly belongs to it. Greece has loyally adhered to us, and resisted all your blandishments and your illegal invasion of her territory. Our position and that of our ally, Austria, in the Balkan provinces will, in the future, be supreme. Serbia and Montenegro have paid the proper penalty for their barbarism and treachery. You cannot disturb our position, because we hold it by the goodwill of our allies, whom we have benefited.

‘And in the future we shall be free from any attacks; for do you think that Belgium or France will be prepared to suffer again as they have suffered now? Our position in Europe will be supreme and unassailable.’

We have no doubt that, if the Germans could speak their own mind, the above represents pretty much their view of what peace at the present time would mean. But what of our own country? Let us hear what their designs upon us are.

‘We admit that we have not yet defeated you English completely, but your time will come. You have done nothing



yet in any way seriously to diminish our power. We have lost some men ; we have lost the fruits of two or three years' industry ; but it is nothing to what you have lost. Our Fleet is still in being, our armies are undefeated, the nation is united in a way which it never was before by the sacrifices it has made and by an ardent feeling of patriotism. The old danger of Socialism is gone. While you have not been able to control your munition workers, and have bribed them to work by paying enormous sums, our men have been working all through the war, patiently, without any extra pay, without any signs of discontent. No ; Germany is strong and united. You have not been able to preserve Ireland from revolt ; we have suffered nothing in Poland or in Alsace or in Schleswig, where you thought there was dissatisfaction.

' And then as to the future. We know that, immediately after the war, we shall recover twice as fast as you will. Whatever debt we may have is a debt due to our own people. What interest we have to pay we shall only have to pay to them—if indeed we pay any interest ; for the nation will readily give up voluntarily what it has lent to the Government. Our people will voluntarily resign what they have contributed, and we shall start on a new era with a heightened patriotism, and with no financial complications. Our position does not depend upon the nice balance of international trade or money-making, as yours does.

' And then we know that our people will work twice as hard as you do. Our organization is better ; our discipline is more perfect. You have no discipline and no organization, and you are torn with party strife. This has been hidden under the momentary enthusiasm of one set of your people for the war ; but it will all burst out again afterwards ; and while we are advancing in every direction, you will have your own quarrels to settle. Do you think that Antwerp or Rotterdam will be prepared to forgo their trade with us ? Do you think that America will go on trading with you instead of trading with us ? We shall command the markets of the world from Bagdad to Hamburg ; and Russia will be compelled to get what she wants from our manufacturers. No ; your idea of an isolated Germany is an impossibility.

' And then in a few years we shall be ready for you. Do you think that you will have the same allies as you have now ? Russia will be powerless against us, for there will be a barrier of neutral states in between. France will not want to fight

again. Italy will have paid the penalty for its treachery and presumption.

‘And then in the Eastern seas. You have violated the European compact by an alliance with a barbarous nation like Japan. But Japan will have an enemy who will be ready to ally herself with us, and will occupy all her attention. You talk about the solidarity of blood between you and America. I do not think you will find there is much of that in the future. America will be on our side. America knows that she has to fear Japan. America will not stand your interference with her trade. Some few bombastic enthusiasts like Roosevelt, who could not carry even his own party, may have talked about the invasion of Belgium and the rights of humanity, but we know that the American does not care for that. It was a blunder on our part to sink the *Lusitania*—we have made some blunders. But we soon found that, if we confined our submarine warfare to the Norwegian and Danish and Dutch ships that were trading with you, and had no American citizens on board, we need not fear their protests. They were just as much annoyed with you for stopping their mails or interfering with their trade as they were with us. There are only two things that Americans take much care for: one is to secure the German and the Irish vote at presidential elections, and the other is to make it quite clear that the great American nation will be free to collect the wealth of the world.

‘No, you will have no allies. And then think what a power there will be against you! We shall not make the mistake in the future that we have made in the past. We know now what to expect in Africa, and all our colonies will be strong centres of military power. We have learnt the elevating influence in our own country of compulsory military service; we shall elevate the African native in the same way; and great armies, with German officers and German munitions and German science and German *Kultur*, will be ready to go out and conquer from South-West Africa and from the Cameroons and from East Africa, and will create for us a great empire in Africa.

‘And then in Turkey. We are there by the best of all tenures—because the Turks feel that it is we and we only that have saved them; and in a few years Turkey, governed as you govern Egypt, but with more regard to the rights of the people, will be a very different country. Our railways will traverse the whole of the land; the army will not only be, as it is now, the finest military material in the East, but it will be well controlled and

well officered and well equipped. And when the next great war begins, there will be five hundred thousand Turkish soldiers on the frontier of Egypt, and a network of strategic railways to enable them to cross the desert.

‘And then think of your own land. You have suffered enough, you think, in the present war by our Zeppelins and our submarines ; but in the next war our Zeppelins will be counted by hundreds, and our submarines will be clustered round every port. And you may destroy a few ; but I think that very soon your people will learn what they have tried to make Germany suffer in the present war. They will learn what starvation means.

‘And we shall have the sympathy of the rest of the world on our side. Why, even now, in Sweden and in Spain and in Greece and in South America, amongst all the neutral nations, your statesmen have tried to intrigue against us, but they have found that the people will not believe your statements. For they know that the victory of Germany means an era of peace. The final decisive victory will and must undoubtedly be with us Germans. Then we shall be in a situation to bestow, not only on ourselves but on all civilized mankind, a lasting and the only true peace, and to maintain it. The entire course of the present war proves that we Germans are singled out by Providence to march at the head of all *Kultur* peoples and to lead them to assured peace under our protection, because we have not only the requisite might, but also the highest mental creative gifts, and form the crown of *Kultur* in the whole creation. Therefore it is reserved to us to do what no nation has hitherto achieved, namely, to bestow peace on the entire world. We Germans, together with the lordship over unruly neighbours, will also assume the office and duties of peace police, and with our own strength will maintain them against every side. We shall know how to nip in the bud all disturbances of peace. Submission to our leadership, which is in every respect superior, is therefore the sole and surest means to a prosperous existence for every nation, especially for neutrals, who would do best to join us voluntarily and trust themselves to us.’

Something like that represents very much what Germans think and hope for. We have been told, in fact, that peace now would give ample opportunity for preparation. And this is what preparation means.

There is another and a different ideal amongst some

Germans, and perhaps that may interest our readers. The following is a quotation from two remarkable articles published in *Die Zukunft* last April by Herr Maximilian Harden. In the passage that we give he represents President Wilson as speaking, and puts his own ideas into his mouth :

‘ It would be under gentle compulsion to bury deep and bury quickly the idle remembrance of fruitless strife, in order that the stink of its rottenness might nowhere poison the will for great clean human business, yielding fruit to justice and civilization, to those near and those far away. He who holds us for nothing but hucksterers, without ideals and without reverence for the noble works fashioned by brain and hand, cannot doubt that we, North and South America, will, for the sake of custom and a market, if for nothing else, take the new paper-money in payment, that we will set it in circulation and enter with both feet into the Federal Hall, under the dome of which we might deliver our giant island from fear of attack, and from something still more painful, the duty of undergoing uncomfortable militarism. France, so lovably unreasonable, secure against irremediable exhaustion of its reproductive power, well-spring of the finest social delights, surrounded by the bubblings of the old Gallic gaiety, France neutralized, and that soon it may be, at its own desire, like the free Belgium (free too from lust of revenge), the costs of whose rebuilding will be borne, half of them by Germany, and a quarter of them by England and France respectively. Great Britain, Land Power and Sea Power, grown out of the fretful desire to be the suspiciously grumbling trustee of Europe, rudely awakened out of supine slumber and easy-going comfort, honestly reconciled with the German Empire, to which it has opened coaling-stations and large fertile lands for settlement, lands not cut through by wedges of alien peoples ; first amongst its peers upon the seas, that are freed now from rights of capture and every other bad custom of the times of envious brigandage. Russia, purged clean at last after the hurricane from Tartar squalor and all relics of ghostly nonsense, with a broad outlet into the always open sea, rid wholly of the craving to make community of creed, out beyond lakes and mountains, contribute to its power, under engagement to the International Court of Justice not to cut short the political rights of Balts, Finns, Poles, Ukrainians, and Letts ; peasant country, using all its strength for modern methods, schools,



roads, changing its cities from garish boils to reservoirs of the strongest forces of the people, purifying its *tchin*, spiritual and secular, in the fire of unfettered popular wrath. Austria-Hungary, a league of States, between the German and the Swiss pattern, into which Serbia, with all the Serbian people and with good commercial harbours, is admitted as an independent Federal State, like Saxony in Germany, and into which every Balkan State can be admitted when it will; master of its Adriatic coasts, from which the West-Slavs scare away the inheritor of Rome, firm and clear in the determination to eliminate harmful prejudice, to secure every nationality its own tongue, every member of the body of the Empire freedom of movement; in the Near East, Sower and Reaper. Germany . . . but you will see how Germany will display its glory, when peace has come, and we no longer with fevered heads dispute what sort of submarine attack is permitted, what sort forbidden. When everywhere freedom reigns, kindness without weakness commands, and the rights of men are respected, even in the tattered beggar. When Europe can speak before the graves and urns of those who are fallen: "It was for this that ye died; not for bits of territory coveted yesterday, and to-morrow without delight, nor for the work, uncongenial to our age, of implanting fragments of our stock, about which morbid matter was soon running from our own flesh and blood. Ye died for clear freedom and for a worthy peace, its foundations deep in the rock to the weal of the Fatherland, and Mother Europe. And a death of more beautiful consecration no German maiden has ever besought in prayer for her beloved." Then the survivors need no longer put back the clock, in order that their day of sunshine may be longer.'

We believe that our readers, if they think over the situation, will see that to make peace under existing conditions would be disastrous for the cause for which we are fighting; and perhaps what we have said will make it clear that in any case making peace will be difficult, and that there is in all probability before us a long period of arduous labour and warfare to keep what we possess. Unless we can inflict a very real defeat on Germany by land and by sea our future must be most precarious. But now let us turn to the war and try ourselves to realize what the situation is.

At the time when these words are being written, July 3, the war is approaching its crisis, and the next two months must be of paramount importance for the future. We know nothing of the plans or purposes of the Allies, but sufficient indications, which have been made public, will make it apparent that we are on the eve of changes. In East Africa the campaign seems to be drawing to its close. Egypt is probably safe from invasion. For the moment the Russian and British forces surrounding Turkey are waiting. At Salonika, in Armenia, in Mesopotamia, at Suez, there are large bodies of men collected. How they are to be employed, and what the policy of the Allies may be, has not been made apparent. In the east of Europe Russia has already begun an offensive on a large scale, amply equipped now with guns and munitions. She has made a magnificent start, and we are daily waiting for news of how she progresses. We do not suppose that she will be allowed to continue her career unsupported by her Allies. The Italians appear, unaided, to have checked and begun to turn the tide of invasion, and it is quite impossible to think that, if the Russians persist in their attacks and continue to be successful, great relief will not come there. At Verdun the French for four months have endured the most tremendous attacks. We know that they have been offered assistance from our troops in any way if they desire it, and they have not asked for it. Meanwhile on the English front there has been continuous fighting, and a serious effort has just begun. Are we ready?

Readiness implies three things. It implies, first of all, men. If we are to believe Colonel Churchill, we have more men than we know what to do with, and we have very large reserves training in this country. Yet the problem cannot be settled in the somewhat offhand way that he proposes. We do not know yet what the German reserves are. They have very large forces in front of us. They have a considerable army of occupation in Belgium which if we made any advance would be available for use against us. They claim to have large

reserves ready for replacing losses. How great the cost of an advance may be we know only too well. If we are at all successful great battles in the open may follow which will test to the uttermost the skill of our generals, many of them totally inexperienced in such warfare, and the mobility and discipline of our new troops. We shall undoubtedly want all the men we can get. Shall we really be able to bring the last million men into the field and declare checkmate?

Readiness means, in the second place, munitions; and here we have every reason for thinking that a great change has been made. Of the importance of munitions recent events have given abundant testimony. The Italians tell us that, when the Austrian advance began, it was backed up by two thousand cannon on a front of something like twenty miles, which meant a gun for every twenty yards, and that the rain of shells was tremendous. The Russians ascribe the celerity of their advance to the excellent artillery they now possess. In the future a tremendous and continuous supply of shells, an enormous number of guns of every calibre, are necessary if any advance is to be possible. We cannot feel wholly satisfied with the response that the Labour of our country has given to the demands upon it.

In a speech delivered by M. Albert Thomas, the French Minister of Munitions, at the Ministry of Munitions in London, to Labour leaders, he put before them what the French workmen had done. He describes how they discovered in France, owing to the enormous consumption of ammunition at the battle of the Marne, the necessity of organizing an industrial programme which surpassed everything which, until then, could have been imagined necessary for the needs of the war. The workers who had been sent out to the battlefield were called back to the workshops. They came back with the knowledge that there, in the shops, lay their duty to the nation. They have used all their strength to increase the output of munitions. 'I have known of some who died at their work.' 'I have known of men who remained constantly at their task,

beyond the usual overtime, sacrificing their customary sleep. In all the workshops of France, from September to February, there were neither weekly rest days nor holidays. So long as the machinery was running, the workers remained in the shops without rest or holiday.'

'Our workers,' he goes on, 'were accustomed to meet in their Unions and to discuss and assert themselves in many matters. To-day they have one single aim. . . . In time of peace . . . we had our strikes . . . but since the war I affirm, with full knowledge, that there has not been a single strike in France, not even one of those little twenty-four hour strikes by means of which workpeople shew their discontent. . . . We might have given orders; we could have introduced into the shops the military discipline which existed in principle; but that has not been found necessary or advisable. . . . We do our duty to the nation equally in the shops. If we are sent back to fight, we shall accept the order as an honour.'

We are afraid that we cannot help contrasting with that some things that we have read of in this country. It is difficult to understand how, when France had already discovered, after the battle of the Marne, the need of organizing her industry, it was not apparent to this country until a political agitation had brought it to the minds of the Government many months later; and we are expressing a very widespread feeling shared by all classes of the country in condemning the spirit which some of our workers have shewn. There were some who refused to sacrifice their Easter holidays in spite of great pressure. Some even would not sacrifice their Whitsuntide holidays. There have been strikes in South Wales and on the Clyde and at Barrow; there have been many hours lost in other places; and constantly we have heard of agitators who have made the work of the Government more difficult. They have been singularly short-sighted. They have opposed compulsion in any form because they fear industrial compulsion; and then they have produced exactly the conditions which are most likely to bring that about. The Trade Union movement and the organization of working men has had opponents in this country; but it has had



a considerable amount of sympathy from a great body of people who have felt that some such organization was necessary to ensure a more equal distribution of wealth ; and had it not been for the general sympathy of considerable classes, the workers would not have gained the power that they possess. They must realize that if the nation as a whole chose to exert itself against them it could do so. What has now been done is, to make a large section of the nation who sympathized with them very suspicious of Labour movements in the future. What, had they been wise, the agitators would have done, would have been to do all in their power, as a large majority of the responsible Labour leaders have done, to organize the workmen for a crisis, recognizing that they, like our soldiers at the front, must make sacrifices. Had they done so, their position in the future would have been very strong. Now there will be, after the war, very great misgivings. If we cannot rely upon the working classes of the country, or a section of them, rising above class distinctions and individual gain, then it will be necessary to adopt means to curtail their power. They will produce just the industrial compulsion which they claim to dread.

The third requisite for success in the future is capable leadership—capable leadership both at home and abroad. We have had to criticize, and to criticize very severely, the leadership both of our statesmen and, in certain cases, of our generals. We have recently witnessed a flood of apology. The members of our Government have told us that they are a very able and patriotic body of men. What has to be remembered is, that war differs from ordinary politics by the fact that events bring a definite and decisive judgement. The incapacity and folly of statesmen in times of peace is often concealed, and can be explained away by successful oratory and clever journalism. But neither journalism nor oratory has any permanent power in war time. What the nation requires now is not good words or ingenious head-lines. It demands success. And no cleverness of defence or ingenuity of language will avail us unless our armies are successful in the field ; nor, without

winning real success, can we hope to make any peace in the future which will guarantee the safety of our country.

Two events that have happened recently demand notice. A great naval battle has been fought, and the strange sequel has led to the somewhat epigrammatic statement that, if English people do not know when they have lost a battle, they also do not know when they have won it. With extraordinary mendacity and astuteness the Germans published abroad an account of their victory in a great sea-fight long before our battleships had come home from chasing their fleet into its harbours, and for a time our Admiralty and those who had access to sources of information had no knowledge of the fight except what the Germans chose to give. Then came a curt message from the Admiral, stating facts with no embellishment, written without regard to its effect upon the public mind, and without any knowledge of the German reports which were circulating round the world. It is difficult to help thinking that the Admiralty might have shewn some more imagination in the way in which they gave information to the public. For undoubtedly at first it created the impression that the German reports were more or less correct. That in every essential point we were victorious is undoubted. There may still be doubt as to the extent of the loss which we inflicted upon the enemy. But all private and public information that comes to us makes it more and more apparent that the actual material loss was very great. No one who took part in the battle has any doubt that a crushing blow was inflicted upon the enemy.

And the naval battle was followed by the startling and dramatic death of Lord Kitchener by the chance of war. About Lord Kitchener's conduct of the war there has been much discussion and controversy. At one time the dissatisfaction expressed was very strong. But just before his death he met in private conference all his most severe critics in the House of Commons, and we are told that he convinced them that their suspicions and attacks were not justified. For one thing we are certain that we can thank him. He made it quite clear both to the nation

and to the Government that this war was something far greater than they expected. By his first demand for a hundred millions of money—how insignificant it seems to us now!—and 300,000 men, he prepared us for much greater sacrifices, and his name helped in the magnificent rally of voluntary recruits to the Army. More than that we need not now say. He died just at the moment when the armies that he had organized were ready for fighting; when we had a million and a half of trained troops straining on the leash, and an equal number of reserves. For nearly forty years he had fought in his country's service; for five and twenty years he had occupied a great place in the public mind. He had carried to a successful close two difficult campaigns in Egypt and in South Africa. He had commanded and reorganized the armies in India, and had become the British representative in Egypt at a very difficult period of our occupation. Those who are most inclined to criticize him or to disparage him will never have doubted that he is to be remembered in the roll of great Englishmen who, in many lands and under varied chances, have fought and governed and laboured for the building up of the Empire, for the cause of their country and the well-being of humanity.

---

#### THE VIRGIN BIRTH.

1. *The Virgin Birth of Jesus. A Critical Examination of the Gospel Narratives of the Nativity, and other New Testament and Early Christian Evidence and the alleged Influence of Heathen Ideas.* By G. H. Box, M.A., Lecturer in Rabbinical Hebrew, King's College, London; Hon. Canon of St. Albans. With a Foreword by the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. (Sir Isaac Pitman and Sons, Ltd. 1916.)
2. *Das Weihnachts-Evangelium auf Ursprung und Geschichte untersucht.* Von D. Dr. HUGO GRESSMANN, ao. Professor der Theologie an der Universität Berlin. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1914.)

At the present moment our minds are turned away from the controversies which interested us but a few years ago. There are other aspects of Christian thought and theology which

occupy our attention. We are not thinking much of the question of miracles or the Virgin Birth of our Lord. From that point of view we feel it unfortunate that Mr. Box' excellent and learned book which was conceived under other conditions should appear at the present time. It will not meet with the recognition that it deserves. On the other hand, the time will come when all such questions will be opened again, and it is of great importance that those to whom the call does not come directly to help their country in its present need and who have the ability and opportunity should be striving to keep alive the lamp of learning and be ready for the day when our students come back from the camp and field of battle with widened experience, with quickened enthusiasm and livelier intellect.

There can be little doubt that this controversy will not be allowed to rest, and Mr. Box' book gives an opportunity of reviewing once more some of the questions at issue. He is well known as one of the most learned Rabbinical students in the country. He can supply us with knowledge most difficult for the majority of us to attain; and it is increasingly recognized that in order correctly to understand the conditions under which the Gospel was preached, we must use every source of information available. All that he gives us on this subject represents a real addition to our knowledge.

Professor Gressmann's book represents a very different point of view. He belongs to the school best known through its founder, Herrmann Gunkel, Professor in Giessen, which attempts to derive a large part of the Old Testament teaching from Folklore. From this point of view Professor Gressmann has written a work on the 'Moses Legend,' and now he is using the same method of explaining the 'Legends' which surround the story of the Birth of Christ. For that we are dealing with legends he does not think it necessary to prove. 'The literary character of the Christmas Gospel is unmistakeable. When angels come down from heaven and appear to men, there is no historical story, but only Legend whose historical background has been decked with the golden threads of phantastic fables.' The manner in which Professor Gressmann deals with these stories will be interesting to our readers, and Mr. Box' book will enable us to examine some of the main points in the controversy.

What is the character of the narrative in the first two chapters of St. Matthew? It has been maintained for example by Usener, by Schmiedel and by Soltau that it is of pagan and Gentile origin.



This appears to them necessary for their purpose because they can find no traces of the origin of the story of the Virgin Birth in Jewish tradition, and therefore they must bring in somewhere or other a pagan source. 'For the whole birth and childhood story of Matthew,' writes Usener, 'in its every detail it is possible to trace a pagan sub-stratum. It may have arisen in Gentile-Christian circles, probably in those of the province of Asia.' This position Mr. Box meets directly, and supported by Professor Schechter—a well-known Rabbinical scholar—maintains that it is entirely Jewish in character.

'To us it seems to exhibit in a degree that can hardly be paralleled elsewhere in the New Testament the characteristic features of Jewish Midrash or Haggada. It sets forth certain facts and beliefs in a fanciful and imaginative setting specially calculated to appeal to Jews.'

Mr. Box works this thesis out in each successive section and shews how there is a clear belief or fact which represents the historical kernel, set forth in a setting of the historical character of which we are less certain. The genealogy shews the official descent of Jesus from David—that He is, as the Messiah was to be, the 'Son of David.' The Birth-narrative shews that He was Son of God born of the Virgin Mary. The stories of the second chapter all turn on the Birth at Bethlehem, that Jesus is a light to the Gentiles, probably also the descent into Egypt.

A further question now rises in our minds—Were these stories which we have known from childhood, which are associated with so much of the charm of Christmas, true? On this subject Mr. Box does not speak decisively, and here he is right. Our first duty is to separate what is important from what is of secondary interest. The traditional teaching of the Church has clearly recognized what it lays stress on—that Jesus was the Christ, born of the seed of David according to the flesh—*i.e.* in His earthly genealogy, the Son of God, born of the Virgin Mary, born too at Bethlehem, the city of David. The stories in which these beliefs are entwined may be true, but we must not allow the question of their historical truth to be considered essential. They enshrine in a beautiful setting eternal truths. That is enough.

And yet! How inadequate seem all the attempts to explain them away! Perhaps it may interest our readers if we turn to the explanation which Professor Gressmann gives of the story of the Shepherds.

Plutarch narrates the following story of the birth of Osiris :

‘ On the first day (*i.e.* on the first of the intercalary days inserted in the Egyptian calendar at the end of the year) Osiris was born, and coincident with his birth a voice came down, saying that the Lord of all cometh forth into the light. Some say that a certain Pamyle in Thebes while drawing water from the temple of Zeus (*i.e.* Amon) heard a voice which bade him proclaim aloud that Osiris the great king and benefactor had been born. Thereupon he brought up Osiris, when Cronos entrusted him to his charge, and the feast of the Pamyles was held in his honour, which is like the festivals in which the Phallus is carried.’

Here, we are told, we have the origin of the story of the Shepherds. To an ordinary person it is difficult to see the resemblance. But here it is. Let us see how it is arrived at.

First, we have to realize that the story in St. Luke is composite. The shepherds represent an independent myth, which has been combined with the story of the Virgin Birth. The parents Mary and Joseph have no place in it in its original form. It was a ‘foundling story.’ The shepherds were bidden by the Angel to go to their stable. There they would find the child, ‘wrapt in swaddling clothes and lying in a manger.’ Why should this have been mentioned except as a sign to the shepherds? Then the shepherds brought up the child.

It is pointed out that there are accidental variations between this story and that of Osiris, arising from the different circumstances. In the Egyptian story the ‘foundling’ is exposed on the banks of the river; in the Bethlehem story—as befits a pastoral country—in a manger. Egypt also knows nothing of swaddling clothes, which are a Palestinian custom. But all the same it is maintained there are considerable resemblances. In both cases there is a voice from heaven. In both the child is called ‘Lord’ (*κύριος*); in one ‘Benefactor’ (*εὐεργέτης*), in the other ‘Saviour’ (*σωτήρ*), which are almost identical. In both the divine command is carried out, and in both stories those who receive the divine command are laity of the lower orders.

What happened, then, was that the Osiris legend became localized in Bethlehem as a Christ-myth. This is considered to be proved by the fact that a cave where Christ was born was shewn. Then this Christ-myth became a Jesus-myth in Jewish-Christian writers.

It has been necessary of course to curtail the argument, but we have endeavoured to state it fairly. We commend it to the attention of those who are so anxious that we should shew

proper respect for German theology. For ourselves we consider it to be learned trifling of the most contemptible sort, nor do we care to waste more time on such unsubstantial imaginings.

If one studies a sufficient amount of this theology, what strikes one as most remarkable is the manner in which the critics contradict one another. If there were a sound and scientific basis to this attack on the Christian doctrine of the Nativity we should find that critics generally would agree. Instead of that there is complete chaos. For example, a large number of critics aim at eliminating the idea of the Virgin Birth from St. Luke's narrative, and therefore would strike out St. Luke i 34, 35. The only textual authority for the omission of v. 34 is one Old Latin manuscript. There is no textual authority for omitting v. 35, and as it is quoted in Justin Martyr it may reasonably be considered to be one of the best attested verses in the New Testament. No one in fact but an adherent of modern 'criticism' would be sufficiently unscientific to omit the verse on such grounds. But many of these do, and their parrot-like English copyists say in a confident way 'These words form no part of the original text.' Now, however, Professor Gressmann (who wants the words for his own purpose) says that to omit them is impossible.

Again, it has been customary to deny that Jesus was born at Bethlehem.

'In some quarters' (so Mr. Box writes) 'the very idea of taking seriously, for instance, the Gospel account of Our Lord's birth at Bethlehem is dismissed as absurd. It is assumed as axiomatic that Jesus was born at Nazareth. In the face, however, of the fact that such scholars as Spitta and W. Weber have published, within recent years, elaborate critical essays to shew that Jesus was actually born at Bethlehem, the attitude of contemptuous denial adopted in these circles becomes a little foolish.'

Again, what one notices is the hardihood with which critics will correct or mutilate or rewrite their authorities. Of course if I am allowed to do that I can make any theory appear plausible, and of course it is true that there are mistakes in most documents. But that is not evidence for any particular mistake, and very strong grounds must be found to obtain general acceptance. Professor Lake, for example, wants to read 'four' for 'fourteen' (ΔΙΑΔΕΤΩΝ for ΔΙΑΙΔΕΤΩΝ) in Gal. ii 1 to suit a revised chronology; but as Professor White points out numbers are generally written at full length.

We have already seen how critics differ on the subject of

interpolations in St. Luke i 34, 35. Let us now see how they differ as to omissions. We will first take Mr. Box' account of Usener's views.

'Usener supposes a certain amount not only of interpolation but also of omission to have taken place. "We are," he says, "in a position to infer with certainty from ii 5, that in the original of the narrative after i 38 stood the further statement hardly to be dispensed with (even though judged inadmissible by the redactor who interpolated i 34 f.) that Mary was then taken to wife by Joseph, and that she conceived by him.'"

Now let us turn to Gressmann. His idea is quite different. The origin of the story of the Virgin Birth was the heathen story of the birth of a child through the intercourse of a god with a human virgin. This is what St. Luke i 35 really conceals. We have always thought that the whole language and context imply something very different. But that is because in St. Luke's version a part of the story has been omitted.

'This cannot have been the end of the story. It imperatively demands a continuation, in which the fulfilment of the angel's word was described. Perhaps it was only a short concluding sentence: "Thereafter came the Holy Ghost upon Mary, and the Power of the Highest overshadowed her." Perhaps on the other hand more has fallen out. At any rate, it is characteristic that this necessary point is wanting. It was too mythological and therefore offensive.'

We need not illustrate the point further. It is obvious that with complete license of omission and interpolation any narrative can be given any complexion which suits the theory. But this does not appeal to one as a scientific method of procedure, and the necessity for it creates a presumption against all such speculations. They imply, as Mr. Box puts it, 'that the symmetry and substance of the Lukan account must be destroyed: it must be torn to shreds and wholly rewritten.'

We have not space to take our readers over all the points of the controversy and we must refer them to Mr. Box' book, but the more we read this modern criticism the more unsubstantial and unreal it appears. It does not attempt to prove, it cannot in fact prove, that the Christian tradition is untrue; it assumes this untruth as axiomatic because it implies what is supernatural and therefore cannot be true. But to the Christian the whole life of our Lord is supernatural, *i.e.* contrary to natural phenomena as we know them, and a supernatural Birth has always been felt by Christian theology to be fitting and harmonious. In



the documents that we possess such a Birth is clearly and unmistakeably taught. There is a beautiful tenderness and self-restraint in the narratives. The criticism which has attacked them has largely been shewn to be the result of half-knowledge.

'It is no doubt possible,' writes Mr. Box, 'for individual believers, who have lived for a long time in an atmosphere of belief which has been created by age-long teaching of the full Catholic doctrine, to rest in a position which asserts the reality of the Incarnation apart from the Virgin Birth. But for the Church to adopt such a position authoritatively would surely be disastrous. Sooner or later, the results would inevitably work themselves out in a "reduced" Christology, and a "reduced" Christianity.'

ARTHUR C. HEADLAM.

---

## SHORT NOTICES.

### I. BIBLICAL STUDIES.

*A Companion to Biblical Studies.* Being a Revised and Rewritten Edition of *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*. Edited by W. EMERY BARNES, D.D., Fellow of Peterhouse, Hulsean Professor of Divinity. (Cambridge: at the University Press. 1916.) 15s. net.

THERE are many besides the reviewer to whom the appearance of a new edition of *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible* will appear as 'something of a pronouncement,' if we may venture to borrow a well-known preacher's description of the sermon that he had just delivered. As we look at the battered and well-thumbed volume purchased years ago for eighteen pence, and since carried half over Europe and a large part of England, we think that we know pretty well both its merits, which are great, and its defects, which are inevitable in a work compiled more than twenty years ago. The book was, as is well known, of a composite character, the handiwork of many scholars, the majority of them of great distinction and many of them now dead; and in such circumstances an editor deserves great sympathy and large allowances in the performance of a very difficult task. It is only just that this should be remembered, since in some cases at any rate the editorial method may well be open to criticism.

For example, Bishop Perowne's article on the Hexateuch is revised so effectually that it is perhaps hardly fair that the author should be made to share the responsibility for it, unless the passages for which he is not responsible are more clearly indicated ; and a similar difficulty may be felt in regard to the articles on the Poetical and Prophetical Books by Dr. Charles Taylor and Dr. A. B. Davidson, if they are to be quoted as theirs. The question does not of course arise in the same way in regard to Dr. J. O. F. Murray's section on the ' Introduction to the Synoptic Gospels,' or Dr. Stanton's on ' The Progress of Revelation,' or Bishop Ryle's Introduction to the Apocrypha, since the authors are alive to express disagreement instead of gratitude in the unlikely event of their being inclined to do so. In some cases the revision has been carried out by the original writers : this is notably the case in regard to Bishop Ryle's articles on ' The Structure of the Bible ' and ' Limits and Growth of the Bible,' Dr. Armitage Robinson's section on ' The History of the Apostolic Age,' Dr. Gwatkin's appendix, now a separate article, on the Jewish People, and Dr. Bonney's on Geography and Geology.

In some instances it seems to have been felt that the only alternatives were omission or substitution. The former course has been adopted in regard to Bishop Westcott's appendix on ' Sacred Books of Præ-Christian Religions,' Mr. A. Carr's sections on ' Bible History, Old Testament and Apocryphal,' and ' Synopsis of Gospel History ' with the added Notes on the Miracles and Parables in the Gospels and the Sermon on the Mount and other Discourses, as well as the collection of Old Testament quotations in the New Testament. Some of these omissions will be greatly regretted by many, for the same ground is not completely covered by the additions. Dr. Sinker's two articles on the text and translations of the Old Testament are replaced by new ones written by Mr. Elmslie of Christ's College. The study on the Historical Books by Dr. Lumby is replaced by a new article from Mr. H. C. O. Lanchester, except in the case of Esther, which may be denoted as BL, being Dr. Lumby's work with an opening and conclusion by the Editor to which the author would probably not have assented. Professor Robertson Smith's appendix on ' The Nations surrounding Israel ' is retained as a separate chapter revised by Dr. Barnes, who also contributes a section on the Sacred Literature of the Gentiles as to which our chief regret is that it is so short. He has revised Dr. F. Watson's sections on Religious Observances, etc. (somewhat drastically), Dr. Lumby's on Literature and on

Military Affairs, Bishop Awdry's on Social Ordinances, Mr. A. A. Bevan's on the Arts, re-writing the portion which deals with Measures, Weights and Money, and Mr. Houghton's contributions on Zoology and Botany. For Dr. Lumby's article on Chronology a new one by Dr. Barnes is substituted in which the comparative method so conspicuous in the older book has disappeared. In regard to the New Testament he differs, as he points out, from the Dean of Wells as to the dates of St. Paul's career.

'The Later History of the Jews to the Birth of Christ' is dealt with by Mr. Lanchester, and many of the New Testament sections are entirely new. Dr. A. E. Brooke writes on St. John's Gospel and the Johannine Epistles, the Editor on the Acts and also on the Pastoral Epistles, the authenticity of which he defends. The other Pauline Epistles are the subject of an article by Mr. Valentine Richards; Hebrews and the Catholic Epistles have been entrusted to Mr. B. T. D. Smith; the article on the Apocalypse is by Dr. Swete; and Mr. G. H. Clayton contributes eight pages on the Theology of the New Testament. Of the remaining articles we note a few editorial additions to Dr. W. F. Moulton's study on the English Bible; Professor Skeat's Glossary is unaltered save for the addition of a few words, and Mr. A. T. Chapman's Index of Proper Names apparently stands as it was. The Index of Subjects and the Concordance have been thoroughly revised by Dr. Watson of Peterhouse, and there are ten useful maps.

We have only space to refer to one feature with greater detail—the additions to knowledge and alteration in dating and description which a quarter of a century has brought about. It was not till the middle of the period, in 1901-1902, that the three great black masses of diorite which we know as the Code of Hammurabi were discovered, and the Odes of Solomon, the Logia and the Freer MS. of the Gospels have all come into prominence in the same time. Dr. Murray's revision of his article on 'Textual Criticism of the New Testament' introduces Gregory's new system of numeration—a fact which the student who has both editions will need to bear in mind. Some of the alterations of dating are noteworthy. Thus the Book of Ecclesiasticus is now placed before 170 instead of about 180 and the Psalms of Solomon as c. 40 instead of 70-40. The 'Testament of the XII Patriarchs,' instead of being assigned as before to the close of the First century A.D., becomes 110-40 B.C. The 'Assumption of Moses' is now dated during our Lord's earthly life, and the Book of Jubilees, which was assigned in the older

book to the earlier half of the First century, is antedated to the end of the Second century B.C. The 'Ascension of Isaiah' is added but not dated. Papias' 'Exposition of the Oracles' is now put as 130-140 instead of 120 and Theophilus of Antioch ten years later (c. 180) than before, while instead of the death of Justin Martyr being given as c. 148 we now have 'floruit c. 130-165.' The death of Ephrem Syrus is placed thirty years later (373) than before, but the discovery of the Armenian version of his commentary on the Diatessaron is still described as recent. It is obvious that some of these details are capable of being discussed at considerable length and not without controversy. But what has been said may suffice to give readers, and there should be many especially if cheaper editions are provided, an idea of what they may expect to find. The printing and arrangement of the book are everything that could be desired, and we have so far noticed only one certain misprint—in the last line but one of p. 46.

*The Fourfold Gospel.* Section iv, *The Law of the New Kingdom.*

By EDWIN A. ABBOTT, Honorary Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Fellow of the British Academy. (Cambridge University Press. 1916.) 12s. 6d. net.

THIS volume of 'Diatessarica' deals with the portion of the Ministry covered by St. Mark iv-viii, bringing up the inquiry to the withdrawal into North Palestine and the Confession of St. Peter at Caesarea Philippi. As regards the main thesis of Johannine Intervention, the heart of the volume is contained in the central section (pp. 203-402) upon *Christ's Miracles of Feeding*, which has already been reviewed in these pages: the remainder contributes little to this subject, and nothing of capital importance. The chief points of interest are incidental to particular phrases or expressions. The first Chapter considers the use of 'parables' and 'proverbs,' and contains an interesting discussion of  $\acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu$  [ $\acute{o}$ ]  $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\eta\theta\iota\nu\acute{o}\varsigma$  in St. John iv 37, in which it is shewn that the use of terms is strongly adverse to the usual rendering 'a true saying.' Rather it means 'the Word of Truth,' and the author detects in it a reference to Is. lv 10, 'As the rain . . . giveth seed to the sower and bread to the eater, so shall *my word* be,' with other suggestive implications.

In Chapter ii on 'The Stilling of the Storm' the author believes the language has been affected by songs or narratives dealing with the Resurrection, and thus prepares the way for



his later contention that the Walking on the Sea is largely allegorized from postt-Resurrectional appearances by the Sea of Galilee or in the world of spirits. The phrase he chiefly presses is the passing *ὡς ἦν* of St. Mark iv 36—‘They take him with them, *even as he was*, in the boat.’ This is not very convincing, but less crude than the suggestion that the *προσκεφάλαιον* in the stern of the boat really represents the pillow placed to support the head (*πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ*) in the grave (St. John xx 12). The whole subject is dealt with more at large in Chapter ix entitled ‘Jesus Walking on the Sea.’ In the mazes of discussion, illustration, and suggestion it is difficult to be sure of Dr. Abbott’s constructive outlook; perhaps the truth is that he is content with attempting to disentangle twisted threads. His view of the appearance of the Risen Christ beside the Lake of Galilee is far from clear: it would seem to be in part historic, in part symbolical, in part visionary. But just as he drew freely upon it to account for the incidents connected with the Call of St. Peter in St. Luke v, so here he utilizes it to illustrate, or as it would seem to account for, details introduced in The Walking on the Sea. How this is to be reconciled with relative date of composition is not considered.

The narrative, which St. Luke altogether omits, is regarded as having some basis in actual fact, but as having been freely allegorized, and applied to storms of spiritual temptation and doubt. This explains St. Matthew’s introduction of the trying of St. Peter, to which St. Mark makes no reference. ‘The fourth watch,’ which involves a serious difficulty, if not a discord of time, may perhaps be explained as an allusive reference to the denial of St. Peter, associated with the cock-crowing; but this involves the objection that ‘the fourth watch’ is derived from St. Mark (vi 48), who makes no reference at all to the trying of St. Peter. A still more serious confusion is introduced by connecting the ‘tormenting (*βασανίζειν*) of Peter’ among the waves with ‘the grieving of Peter’ by the lake-side in St. John xxi, unless composite authorship of the Fourth Gospel is assumed.

Combinations more risky still are hazarded. In St. Mark vi 49 (followed by St. Matthew) it is written ‘they supposed it was an apparition (*φάντασμα*).’ St. John makes no mention of this, but writes only ‘They were minded to receive him into the boat; and straightway the boat was at the land for which they were making.’ This is interpreted to mean that the *phantasm* ‘drew’ the boat ashore, and for such drawing the

word ἐλκύζειν might appropriately be used, though as a matter of fact neither ἐλκύζειν nor ἔλκειν is employed, or even implied. St. John nowhere uses ἔλκειν, and ἐλκύζειν only of the Father or the Son drawing men to Himself (vi 44, xii 32). At this stage we are referred to the passage of the *Moralia* 900 F, in which Plutarch is distinguishing φαντασία and φανταστόν 'sense-impression' and 'object of sense' from φανταστικόν and φάντασμα used of hallucinatory impressions. This is a theme familiar to Stoic disputants, who upheld the trustworthiness of sense-impressions. And Plutarch defines φανταστικόν as a διάκενος ἐλκυσμός 'a baseless distortion or aberration, a subjective affection of the mind not due to any actual object of sense.' The true φαντασία results from a real object of sense, the phantasm or hallucination from a baseless aberration of fancy, as in cases of melancholia or madness; and he proceeds to illustrate from classical instances, such as the ghost of Clytemnestra seen by Orestes, and the visions of Theoclymenus in Homer. In further support of the argument Dr. Abbott adduces a passage from Epictetus, in which he urges his hearers, when enticed by the seductions of pleasure, to fix their regards upon the continence of Socrates, and by so doing 'you will overcome the impression and not be drawn astray' (νικήσεις τὴν φαντασίαν, οὐχ ἐλκυσθήσῃ). Here Dr. Abbott renders φαντασία by 'phantasy,' and to the English reader such a translation of one of the commonest technical terms of Stoicism is wholly misleading: φαντασία as we have seen is the antithesis of φάντασμα and φανταστικόν—in the same way as fact to fancy. And he concludes that 'St. John in his version of the Walking on the Sea was not improbably influenced by the Stoic doctrine about phantasma being the result of fear.' Argumentation so forced and fanciful taxes the patience of the reader, and only strengthens the conviction that the author is on a false track, when he searches Stoic writers for clues to Johannine interpretation. St. John's thought moves in regions altogether remote from Stoic thought or terminology. Nowhere is this clearer than in his handling of the Logos doctrine. To Stoic pantheism ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο is not a revelation, but an axiomatic truism; and it is not too much to say, that had the Stoic λόγος been present to the mind of the Evangelist, he would not have used the phrase. In tracing allusions Dr. Abbott's happier efforts are concerned with Hebraic and prophetic literature. He is always on the watch for symbolism, but it is hard to believe that any symbolic intention, suggestive of 'peace,' underlies St. Mark's 'shod

with *sandals*,' or that *ὁ σταυρός* in 'Take up his Cross' of St. Mark viii 34 and parallel passages referred originally to the cross-bar of the yoke.

## II. ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY.

*A Charge delivered by Mark, by Divine Permission and in Obedience to the See of Canterbury Bishop in Corea, to the Clergy of the English Church Mission in that country gathered in Conference at Seoul on Tuesday, August 3, A.D. 1915.*

THE Bishop in Corea's charge to his clergy seems to us of unusual importance. Up to the present time the jurisdiction in Corea has been purely missionary. There has been no organized Church. But the time is now coming when, for various reasons that he gives, the present Bishop in Corea feels that the organization of his diocese will be necessary. We must remind our readers that the English Mission in Corea, after being carried on for a considerable time with little success, suddenly, as is often the case, was marked by a great movement, and that now there is a Church of 5000 or 6000 members, and there is a very considerable prospect that it may grow in the near future. Its present Bishop, who has known the country for many years, is a man of great energy, and under him it is likely the work of the Church may increase much in importance. It is, like other missionary dioceses, one which represents one particular aspect of the Church of England. It is definitely High Church—people might say extreme—and the whole Church is organized on that basis. The Bishop is clearly one of those who would be inclined to sympathize with the Bishop of Zanzibar.

The interest of the Charge consists in the fact that, having the prospect before him of organizing his Church, the Bishop has taken the trouble to lay down the principles on which he would be prepared to act. He has worked out his position with great care and considerable learning. One incidental point seems to us of special interest. Amongst other books he has made use of Wake's *Church Councils*, and has obtained a copy containing MS notes which seem to preserve the tradition and practice of the Diocese of Norwich. The information given by the MS annotator is apparently of some value historically.

The value of the Charge consists in the fact that the Bishop in Corea has adopted a very definite point of view. He desires to emphasize very clearly the distinction of clergy and laity,

to exalt the clergy at the expense of the laity, and then to exalt the Bishop at the expense of the clergy. The sole legislative authority in the Church, in his opinion, lies in the hands of the Bishop, though he should consult the Synod of the Clergy first. In particular, he is very severe on the modern pseudo-Synod—the representative body containing both clergy and laity, to whom legislative power, with voting by Orders, is entrusted. In other words, he would exalt the Bishop as against the whole of the rest of the Church.

Now we think that there is here a fundamental error, and at any rate we would recommend Bishop Trollope to study carefully the Lecture by Mr. Birkbeck on the Russian Church which was reviewed in the last number of the *CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW*. There he will see that it is laid down as a fundamental fact that the Bishop has no authority even in matters of doctrine, except so far as he expresses the mind of the whole Church; that the authority in all matters of faith and morals is the Church and not the clergy of the Church, who are merely the instruments through whom it works. We think, further, that the Bishop in Corea has been led astray by the fact that all the works that he has consulted upon Church Councils have been representative of the traditions created by the mediaeval Church. At the beginning of his Charge he appeals to the undivided Catholic Church, and lays stress upon that as representing what the Church of England appeals to. But he has built up his theory, not on a primitive, but on a mediaeval foundation. It is quite true that from the beginning a distinction of clergy and laity exists, but the distinction is one of function and nothing more. The clergy are the persons appointed to perform certain functions on behalf and as representative of the Church as a whole, and when they act, in Councils or otherwise, as formulating doctrine, they do so, not by any individual and personal authority, but as representatives of the Church. Nor has any conclusion which they arrive at any authority, unless it is accepted by the Church. So an appeal to the fact that in I Peter, for example, the 'royal priesthood,' the 'holy generation' means the whole Church is a quite sound one. That does not prevent there being certain persons, as priests, who will carry out and fulfil the sacerdotal functions of the whole Church, but the essential point is that in these functions they represent the Church. If this is recognized, the problem then becomes: How best can the Bishop act as representing the whole Church? And it may be quite conceivable that to put legislative authority into his hands,



after consulting all sections of the community, might be the best means of doing this, although unfortunately few men can be entrusted with such power. Representative bodies almost always misrepresent the people that elect them, and a wise man, who acts after consultation, will often fulfil what is required far better than all those Synods and Councils and Conferences upon which so much stress is laid. But it must be recognized that he is only authoritative because he represents the whole society and that what he says has no authority unless it is accepted by them.

Now the Bishop is very severe on the 'quasi-Synods' and so on. No doubt the arrangements are clumsy. But they do aim at carrying this ideal out, and there is no particular reason for calling them 'quasi-Synods.' Because at certain periods in Church history only the clergy were members of Synods, or because, when the dioceses were very small, all the clergy were present, and there was no method of representation, it does not therefore follow that different methods, adopted at the present time and made possible by the different conditions of civilization, may not be correct. At the same time, we quite agree that a Synod should be the Synod of all the clergy, whether there are laymen or not; and it may be much easier for the Bishop to get at the opinions of his laity in other ways than by the modern representative Diocesan Conferences.

The question of machinery may really be left to each diocese to work out as best it can. The question of principle cannot be so left; and unless it is recognized that the authority of the Bishop exists only when he speaks as the mouth of the whole Church, any form of constitutional government is wrong and inadequate.

*Our Place in Christendom.* Lectures delivered at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, in the autumn of 1915. With a Preface by the Right Rev. the LORD BISHOP OF LONDON. (Longmans. 1916.) 3s. 6d. net.

THERE are two ways of describing the position of an organized body, and, in particular, a Church. The one is to observe it as it stands to-day, at a bird's-eye view or the 'man in the street's,' and then draw a picture which shall combine, as best the artist may, its different elements. In this way, nothing will be excluded: everything that either exists within the body, or claims to belong to it, will be inserted. You must

leave nothing out, for fear you should be incomplete. You must not discriminate, for then you begin to exclude, and so the man you have to teach may not see something that is really there. The other way relies upon definitions and formularies. It recognizes first of all the limits which are prescribed by the constitution. What falls within these, what answers precisely to them, is admitted into the picture. Nothing else is. You see the institution exactly as it in its documents declares itself to be. You do not allow for varieties : these you regard as lapses, errors, excrescences that ought to be cut off. The first view tends to laxity, the second to legalism. The first will inevitably become inaccurate, the second rigid. In the case of a Church, the first view will regard a certain individual as a Churchman because he says that he is one : the second will deny him the title, or at least declare that he is unworthy of it, because he does not fall within the formal definitions or accept the legal documents in their plain and grammatical sense. Thus, when someone outside the Church of England, and particularly, it would seem at the present time, an Eastern, asks 'What does the Church of England stand for : what does she teach ?' one answer would be 'The High Churchman teaches this : the Low Churchman teaches this : the Broad Churchman teaches this. Therefore the Church of England teaches all these things.' The other answer would be 'The Church of England teaches what those of her formularies which have been assented to by all her office-bearers say in plain language.'

This volume of lectures, written by godly and well-learned men, and sent forth by the Bishop of London in the hope that they 'will enable us more worthily and thankfully to fill our place in Christendom,' for the most part takes the second view. They are based upon history and historical documents : they hint at, rather than allow for, varieties : they plead for freedom but they describe a Body which has a real *ethos* of its own, definite limits, a clear claim. It is difficult, indeed, to see how, if they were coherent, they could do anything else. And it may be worth noting as we pass that the same course is really adopted by those who explain the Church of Rome or even the more conservative Eastern Churches. There are varieties in all these, much larger divergences than those who describe them from within generally recognize. But that does not prevent our arriving at a true picture of the position of each Church if we examine its history and accept its formularies as definitive.

There can be no doubt that Dr. A. J. Mason, Dr. W. H.

Frere, Professor Whitney, Dr. Figgis, Dr. H. S. Holland, Dr. A. W. Robinson and the Bishop of Oxford have given us a very valuable book. They have shewn the place of the Church of England in the history of Christendom and in the life of to-day, as men of learning and candour see it. Others may find in the Church much more, some a good deal less. But for our own part we should say that this view is full, and clear, and rational. It shews the Church of England as she has been, as she means to be, as she really is.

Dr. Mason speaks of the primitive Church. He finds that it held a deposit, a theology, which 'was not to be altered.' The founders themselves continually asserted that view. 'The Apostolical Succession was the series of accredited, authorized exponents of true Christianity.' There is no appeal from 'a defective primitive teaching to a consent of modern and better instructed times.' And so the modern claim for Rome is untenable. To Gregory the Great, the three great Sees—Rome, Alexandria, Antioch—combined to make the See of Peter. Dr. Frere traces out this idea in regard to the Orthodox Eastern Church. He makes much use, we are glad to see, of the Encyclical Letter of the Church of Constantinople of 1895, which some recent controversialists would have been helped by remembering. History makes us certainly to see that, for his claim to be justified, 'the papalist has to prove a universal negative; if his opponent can produce even a single convincing instance against him, the papal case breaks down.' It was thus that papalists took to justifying themselves not by history but by texts, and then used texts which are no more convincing than others which practically contradict them. The Eastern contention is justified by History. Their Church is rigid against all Protestantism; and the Pope to her is the chief Protestant. In this Dr. Frere finds not a barrier but hope. In how fascinating a way, with what faith and foresight, he develops this view, we leave readers to discover for themselves. Dr. Whitney on the Mediaeval Church and on the Reformation, and Dr. Figgis on the Age of Councils and on the idea of National Churches, are more directly historical: how accurately so, those who know their work will not need to be told. Perhaps Dr. Whitney exaggerates the ignorance of Eastern views shewn by St. Gregory, who spent some time in Constantinople: perhaps Dr. Figgis, in his eloquent expositions of the Conciliar theory, does not quite see how entirely this destroys the omnipotence of Maitland's theory as to Roman Canon Law in the Middle Age; but both (though the latter rather

reluctantly) give support to Creighton's emphatic assertion that the English Reformation was not a compromise but the assertion of definite truth, handed down from of old and established by sound learning. Dr. Figgis is at his best when he quotes; very good when he uses Laud, whose appeal to the Eastern Church is as irresistible to-day as when he made it, and expounds 'Febronius'; much less useful when he generalizes (especially when he says 'It will be found that where the Church is strongest it is where the parson's freehold means least,' or, probably by some hasty writing, goes near to asserting that the refusal to identify Church authority with the civil power dates in England from the late Seventeenth or the Eighteenth century).

Dr. Figgis, again, seems to desert the main attitude of the book when he lays undue emphasis on the fact that all the baptized are members of God's Church: he makes (for the moment) no allowance for deliberate heresy or schism. Dr. Holland and the Bishop of Oxford turn rather to exposition than history. The former chiefly expounds Robert Browning, and he writes a little wildly when he attributes all sorts of common infirmities to the fact of Establishment. But he is very refreshing, none the less; and the Bishop of Oxford is inspiring, though he does plead almost fiercely for 'an immense reduction of numbers' in the Church of England. We are not sure that he has at all realized the consequences of his own view: he certainly does not always put it clearly. What does he mean, for example, when he says 'The Church may maintain the stricter rule of marriage for its own members while acknowledging that it is not maintainable for the whole of civil society'? Does he mean that the Church should abdicate her claim to teach unalterable morals? Or that morals are alterable? If the latter, what right has the Church so solemnly to assert her own? Does he simply mean that the Church should say 'I will not allow my members to do such and such things, but I will not think the worse of any persons outside, if they do them'? Or does he mean that when we say 'Thou shalt do no murder' we know that nevertheless some murders will be committed. Surely the fact is that the Church has no business to teach at all unless she teaches the truth.

Some may find, in spite of a fine historical and theological loyalty, a touch of pessimism here and there in some parts of the book; but the cheerful optimism of Dr. A. W. Robinson will reassure them. He is at times indeed more optimistic than accurate, for he even tells us, in his justifiable claim that



England stands for Freedom, that 'we have a free Parliament and a free Press.' When he remembers that at this moment we certainly have neither, he will perhaps see reason to reconsider some of his conclusions. But it is well that such a book as this, which is for the most part seriously historical and theological, and appeals to men who will think and who want to learn, should end on a note of cheerful journalism.

### III. ETHICS.

*The Theory of Abstract Ethics.* By T. WHITTAKER. (Cambridge University Press. 1916.) 4s. 6d. net.

MR. WHITTAKER'S essay is a closely reasoned argument in favour of the recognition of *a priori* elements in the moral judgement. In his view no satisfactory ethical theory can be built upon the assumption that the Good is the fundamental conception. We require some generalized doctrine of right or justice, and this, which may be called Abstract Ethics, is to be distinguished from the pursuit of good in detail, which may more properly be called his Art of Life. After a survey of the history of theories of abstract ethics Mr. Whittaker proceeds to give a very clear and useful exposition of Prof. Juvalta's view with which he is in general agreement. The main points in Juvalta's theory may perhaps be stated as follows: It is impossible to derive moral values from something of which the moral value is not already recognized. We have to admit the primacy and independence of moral values. Nevertheless Kant's solution of the Ethical problem is insufficient for he gives no content to the moral law. We have to recognize diversity of ends; but we may assert that for the realization of any of the various goods which men pursue liberty and justice are requisite. Liberty and justice are therefore universal values and, since the intrinsic and absolute value of the person is the implicit presupposition in all moral valuations, liberty and justice have themselves absolute value. Mr. Whittaker discusses in the light of this theory the questions of Industrialism, International Relations, the pursuit of art for art's sake, and religious persecution. His argument on the last of these subjects, which is particularly interesting, is directed to shewing that only an abstract conception of justice gives us a rational ground for condemning all forms of persecution. Although Mr. Whittaker agrees with Prof. Juvalta in repudiating any metaphysical basis for morality he is prepared

to admit that the existence of *a priori* elements in knowledge and in moral judgement gives us grounds for inference as to the nature of Reality. His modest conclusion may be compendiously stated in his own words :

‘ I simply argue that the existence of inexpugnable *a priori* elements in moral as in natural science entitles us to assert, since nothing comes from nothing, that not only Reason but Justice in some sense is a pre-existent reality ordering the constitution of the whole that is partly known to us in the world and in man.’

Mr. Whittaker’s book is a valuable contribution to the discussion of the fundamental problems of Ethics.

#### IV. LITURGIOLOGY.

*The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great.* Edited from three MSS of the Ninth century by H. A. WILSON, M.A. ‘Henry Bradshaw Society Publications’, vol. xlix. (London : Printed for the Society by Harrison and Sons, Ltd. 1915.) Subscription *one guinea* per annum.

MR. WILSON has placed in the hands of the members of the Henry Bradshaw Society an admirable working edition representative of one group of the authorities for the Gregorian Sacramentary. This is moreover the most important group, in spite of the fact that it represents the Roman Mass Book not as used in its own land, but in the form disseminated in the Frankish Empire. This form was peculiar : it consisted of a *Gregorianum* proper with a quasi-official supplement, and further supplements of a less official and stable kind. Of the three MSS used, one hailing from Cambrai, and the earliest of the three, contains only the *Gregorianum* proper ; the other two contain also the official supplement, each giving a practically identical text ; each also adds in the third place its own collection of Benedictions and additional Prefaces, the two collections being far from identical. Two of the three MSS have been still further added to by later hands, but such additions Mr. Wilson wisely does not reproduce.

For the first time, students have in their hands a working edition of this Roman Mass Book which will serve as an adequate standard of comparison. Muratori’s edition, which has hitherto done duty, was not satisfactory, for it misrepresented the materials which it comprised, and misarranged them. It is a pity that

Mr. Wilson has not further facilitated comparative study by giving in his Introduction the ancient numbering which belongs to the *Gregorianum* proper. Muratori did not give it, for it was not in his sources. He gave the table and the numbering of the sections in the Appendix, and of course Mr. Wilson does also. But the same is needed for the first part. This edition duly notes the few places where the numbering survives in the Cambrai MS, and notices in the Introduction that these figures are consistent and represent an ancient numbering. The Codex Rodradi gives many more of them and by combining the two the complete enumeration can be made out, with only some few points of slight ambiguity chiefly in the closing sections. One more point may be mentioned to supplement the careful introduction which Mr. Wilson has provided. The account of the palimpsest *Gregorianum* of Monte Cassino, which Dom Wilmart gave in the *Revue Bénédictine* of July 1909, threw immense light of an unexpected sort on the whole problem of the *Gregorianum*. Plainly in the Sixth and Seventh centuries Italy was using a very different type of Mass Book so far as arrangement is concerned from this Frankish and Carolingian type; and plainly the distinction of part 1 and part 2 is not so ancient or fundamental as it was thought to be before Dom Wilmart's article appeared. The palimpsest contains combined in the more modern and logical order material which the Frankish Mass Book separates and places in two distinct parts. It also had the Mass-lessons, and therefore in several ways anticipates the *Missale plenum*.

It is clear therefore that there is much more to be done in the study of this Roman Mass Book: and this new edition is all the more therefore a very welcome boon.

## V. BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Letters of Richard Meux Benson, Student of Christ Church; Founder and first Superior of the Society of St. John the Evangelist, Cowley.* Selected and arranged by G. CONGREVE and W. H. LONGRIDGE, of the same Society; with an Introductory Memoir by the Right Rev. A. C. A. HALL, D.D., Bishop of Vermont, U.S.A. (Mowbray. 1916.) 5s. net.

THE memoir with which this book begins has already appeared in the CHURCH QUARTERLY REVIEW. There is an interesting

appendix of sermons and other recollections. And there are two memorials in verse which are nice but not so strong as the lines which Father Benson himself wrote on board ship in the Atlantic :

‘ And the dark heaven in gloom withdraws from sight  
The outline of the future . . .  
So swells the sea before us as we go,  
Yet on we go for all this pomp of wrath.’

Those lines are a symbol of the indomitable hope which rings through the letters, letters so remarkable that the whole of this notice must be devoted to them alone.

The hope springs from a faith which culminates in the ascended Christ.

‘ A real love to CHRIST at the right hand of GOD is what we want, and then even the most important things of the mere Church Militant become insignificant. . . Some one spoke of preaching as *a dying sinner unto dying men*. It is better for us to preach as from a living Saviour to men whom He calls to live in His love. But we must be absorbed in that love as our own life . . . We cannot see where JESUS dwells unless we dwell in the future, as a present already realized. We must come up to heaven, then we see that which shall be hereafter.’

To that sublimity Father Benson ever rises. Yet he forgets not the whole proportion of the faith : ‘ Probably it is well to meditate most upon the Passion when we are strong, and upon JESUS in glory when we are weak.’ No one has ever upheld the ideal of Christ’s humility more frankly. In Christ all is immeasurably great, but the power is only known when used within the quiet and difficult limits of duty. Thus the Church as an imposing organization is no reality to Father Benson :

‘ The Unity of Christendom has never been destroyed, though the Union of Christendom has been disturbed. . . The spiritual energy which originates life needs not the dimensions of space, as does the material nature which it quickens. . . We must get rid of the idea of a great ecclesiastical worldly empire if we are to live through the troubles of the last days. We must be content to see the Church perish upon the earth, before we have any right to say that we are sure that the gates of hell shall not prevail against her. . . the great difference between Catholic development round the throne of JESUS by the power of the HOLY GHOST, and development round an earthly centre of unity.’

These letters are full of philosophy and full of affection : ‘ Reason and love,’ says Father Benson, ‘ are one in GOD.’ And



in 'dear Father Goreh,' the Brahman novice, he writes that 'it was the humility of faith, joined with the depth of a true philosophy, which was so remarkable.' That was sincerest appreciation, for to Father Benson too intellect and heart found largest freedom within the bounds of obedience :

'We none of us can bring anything that is of value. All gifts, eloquence, learning, health, etc., become useful only when they are burnt up by the fire of the HOLY GHOST. Pinewood is as good as mahogany to burn. In the great day of the resurrection may GOD grant our Society to be known by its never-dying flame, whatever the varieties of its graining and colour may have been while here.'

And it was within their Society, as in 'the cloister of CHRIST'S love,' that he could speak freely on deep matters to friends who would understand. To them he could say bold things about the subordinate worth of external miracles ; and speak of a brother's imminent pain with a courage, or death with a joy, which the outer world might think stoical : and, passing over commonplace, express intense affection in terms of the Risen Life which ordinary friends might think impersonal. For it is in the letters to his brothers in Religion that the real man, with his 'heart in its wildness,' more appears. Compare his treatment of the difficult theological notion of 'Nature' in the two sets of letters contained in this book. To those without he is almost content to be merely Augustinian ; to his beloved disciples he is never less than Johannine.

But it was St. John who wrote 'And the whole world lieth in the evil one,' and the thought of the 'natural heart' of Europe more and more rejecting Christ lay almost like a shadow across his mind. Almost, not utterly. His faith, not simple but profound, admitted no despair ; he does not approve 'a certain lack of apprehending GOD'S positive *will* that all men should be saved' ; and

'Whatever the lives of Christians untrue to their faith may be, there is something in the Christian idea of religion—of GOD, of sin, of moral duty, of self-sacrifice, of love, of eternal hope, of the life of righteousness—which is elevating in a way such as no other religion can equal.'

And if visions faded at home—'we need to die to all our own visions, that we may be pure in heart and see GOD'—he looked

with all the bolder hope to the manifestation of Christ through the heathen :

‘ It is not by gradual human effort that the Eternal Light can be brought home to the human reason, but it is by the sudden display of divine power. So in our mission work we have to feel the difference between parochial efforts to ameliorate the evil conditions of a Christian country, and the divine glory ready to co-operate with our faithful endeavours in a heathen land, and, when the fulness of time is come, suddenly changing the whole aspect of society, and calling the whole population from their utter darkness to the bright welcome of the eternal day. . . Christendom is losing its divine consciousness. I have a very confident expectation that by God’s mercy a few years will see the heathen stretching out their hands, and lifting up their hearts to accept the Divine Redeemer. . . . There must be a great struggle before the end, and then—an endless victory—not on earth, but on the throne of God.’

It was refreshment to him to think of far countries, and to visit them. And here too the problem of ‘ Nature ’ comes in from another side. How fresh his appreciation was of natural or architectural beauty may be felt in the two inimitable letters about the Taj at Agra, especially in the second which tells of his return to spend the night in the garden and see the dawn. But when Brother Gardner wrote from Lake Champlain, after ‘ many thanks for your interesting and sportsmanlike letter,’ he goes on :

‘ Well, now to return to our own fair land, the mystical Jerusalem. The fair sights of earth make one always feel the joy of this all the more. Other beauties fade, but every day of the Divine Light shines on in the light of each successive day, until Eternity shall sum up all their brightness in the manifold fulness of Him from whom such gifts of glory came. It makes one feel the weariness of life on earth, and yet it helps one to bear it. How foolish we are to wish to have things bright around us. If we have once seen the heavenly Light we ought to be willing to trust all to Him.’

The same instinct made him dislike pictures in worship, and consider ‘ ritual beauty a necessary evil for secular-minded people.’ Perhaps it explains why he rarely (though most beautifully) writes of the earthly ministry of our Lord, while his meditation on the ‘ mystery ’ of the Incarnation is constant and far-reaching. He moves on a plane of vision beyond the sensible : ‘ Now the mediation of CHRIST is, as it were, the highway of the universe. The hosts of heaven gather round it as their resting-place. Upon it they carry on all their movements.’

This brief notice is more like a catena than a review, yet the quotations made are not a moiety of those worthy to be made. The book is a treasury of Love and Truth, golden grain with all second-rate stuff sifted out by a mind that would have no 'half truths.' A concluding fragment shall contain something steadying and stimulating for days in which we are perhaps too easily disturbed by a dread of failure in our Mother-church of England :

'He had to live a painful life, but was cheerful amidst it all, though sometimes depressed. The body was depressed, but the mind was always resting in God's goodness—not with the ecstasy of a Spaniard, or that mixture of contemplation and action which gives brightness and calmness to an English Churchman, but with a sense of perfect repose in God as the end to be attained when this weary life of isolation and feebleness should be over.'

*A Mediaeval Anthology: being Lyrics and other Short Poems chiefly Religious.* Collected and Modernized by M. G. SEGAR. (Longmans. 1915.) 2s. 6d. net.

THE compiler of this anthology has made a charming little book out of materials which, however familiar to students, are to most readers practically unknown ; and it is safe to say that nearly everyone who buys it will find something which will make him feel amply repaid. The claim made for it that the collection is 'really representative of the mediaeval mind' seems to us to err on the side of excess even if we remember always that it is of England from the Twelfth to the early Fifteenth century that we are supposed throughout to be thinking ; and frankly we fail to recognize the idealist portrait of the 'splendid creatures' with which the land is supposed to have been peopled because 'children who had not the soundest constitutions and the best of health never grew up,' though the criticism of the inadequacy of medical knowledge is no doubt sufficiently just. But if it is the work of the enthusiast rather than the exact scholar it has none the less led the compiler and us with her along very pleasant paths and may, it is to be hoped, awaken the desire for more which will provide the encouragement deserved by the publications of the Early English Text Society, and similar collections on which it is based. The pieces given are modernized and some of them lose somewhat in the process as well as by abbreviation ; but in fairness it must be added that the modernizing is neither perverse nor indiscriminating, and where the old can be retained

by the aid of an explanatory footnote of an obsolete word this has usually been done. The vice of abbreviation is that it necessarily disturbs the balance of judgement if portions of a poem which are deemed heavy or otiose are excised; but in regard to a volume avowedly of selections it would be unjust to complain of this were it not that the Introduction seems not to allow sufficiently for the pruning that has been done. Incidentally we may add that the same Introduction provides one of the most curiously expressed bits of literary criticism that we remember having seen, when it says of the Englishman that 'from his very closeness to Nature he had a quality which made his heart a rich soil for the wave of mysticism which swept over Europe in the Twelfth and Thirteenth centuries.' And we believe that even in the Englishman his intellect played a greater part than the compiler is willing to allow; but in this she has no doubt authority on her side. A very desirable appendix to a second edition which the book well deserves would be a fuller indication of sources. It need not be a long one, but we cannot agree that to anyone not yet conversant with Middle English writings it would be useless.

---



## PERIODICALS.

*The Journal of Theological Studies* (Vol. XVII. No. 67. April 1916. Milford). A. Spagnolo and C. H. Turner: 'An Ancient Homiliary (of Maximus of Turin), III. (Latin text, with note on the authorship by Mr. Turner). C. H. Turner: 'Arles and Rome—the First Developements of Canon Law in Gaul.' V. Bartlet: 'The Ordination Prayers in the Ancient Church Order.' C. Lattey, S.J.: 'The Deification of Man in Clement of Alexandria. Some Further Notes.' R. B. Tollinton: 'The Two Elements in Marcion's Dualism.' E. I. Robson: 'Rhythm and Intonation in St. Mark i-x.' W. W. Covey-Crump: 'The Situation of Tarshish.' (Not Tartessus but a generic name first for Sicily and later Sicily and Sardinia.) F. C. Burkitt: 'The Last Supper and the Paschal Meal.' A. K. Clarke and N. E. W. Collie: 'A Comment on Luke xii 41-58.' N. McLean: 'Textual Criticism of the O.T.' (Strong Criticism of Dr. Emery Barnes on Ps. xcvi 11; quoting Hitzig's address to his students 'Meine Herren, haben Sie eine Septuaginta? Wenn nicht, so verkaufen Sie alles was Sie haben, und kaufen sich eine Septuaginta.') W. H. Frere: 'Brightman *The English Rite*' (3 pp.). W. Sanday: 'J. K. Mozley *The Doctrine of the Atonement*' (very favourable). F. E. Brightman: 'Warner *The Stowe Missal*, II'; 'Wickham Legg *Cranmer's Liturgical Projects*' (Useful list of corrections and additions); 'H. A. Wilson *The Gregorian Sacramentary*'; 'Mearns *The Canticles of the Christian Church*'; 'Woolley *The Bread of the Eucharist*'; 'Wyatt *The Eucharistic Prayer*.'

*The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. XIV. No. 3. April 1916. Williams and Norgate). L. P. Jacks: 'An Interim Religion.' E. W. Hallifax: 'The Self-Revelation of the German War-party before the War. A Pendant to "J'Accuse."' Lord W. Gascoyne-Cecil: 'German Patriotism.' 'The Apocalypse of War.' 'Veni Creator Spiritus!' (By the Author of *Pro Christo et Ecclesia*). W. Temple: 'The Love of God our Hope of Immortality.' H. Elliot: 'A Defence of Scientific Materialism.' Sir R. K. Wilson, Bart.: '"Education has saved the State." Is it the State that has saved Education?' E. T. Webb: 'Madame Montessori and Mr. Holmes as Educational Reformers.' G. G. Coulton: 'The Plain Man's Religion in the Middle Ages.' F. W. Orde-Ward: 'Prolegomena to an Essay on Miracles.' J. Moffatt: '"The Empty Purse." A Meredithian Study for the Times.' M. W. Hoyt: 'The Tyranny of Benefactors.' K. Lake: '"The Stewardship of Faith" and Canon Scott Holland' (6 pp.). H. D. Oakeley: 'Foakes-Jackson (and others) *The Faith and the War*'; 'Loisy *The War and Religion* [E.T.]. F. J. C. Hearnshaw: 'J. W. Graham *War from a Quaker Point of View*' (5½ pp. Critical). G. Dawes Hicks: 'Sorley Marlborough, and other Poems.' S. A. Cook: 'Macnicol *Indian Theism*'; 'Stevenson *The Heart of Jainism*'; 'R. W. Frazer *Indian Thought Past and Present*' (5½ pp. favourable).

*The Irish Church Quarterly* (Vol. IX. No. 34. April 1916. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis). Ven. R. W. Boyd (Archdeacon of Ardagh): 'A. G. Elliott, Bishop of Kilmore, Elphin and Ardagh.' R. A. P. Rogers: 'Idealism and Realism' (Reviews the Bp. of Down's *God and Freedom in Human Experience*). W. S. Kerr: 'Ireland and the War.' E. J. Gwynn: 'The Stowe Missal' (Based on Sir George Warner's edition for H.B.S. Interesting). F. W. O'Connell: 'Kohleth and Khayyam.' Very Rev. C. T. Ovenden (Dean of St. Patrick's): 'The Evolution of Body and Mind in Man.' J. N. Shearman: 'Teleology' (Reply to Archdeacon Foley). E. W. Greening: 'Rawlinson *Dogma, Fact and Experience*.' N. J. D. White: 'E. A. Abbott *Christ's Miracles of Feeding*'; 'Buchanan *Sacred Latin Texts*, III.' W. H. Dundas: 'K. Lake *The Stewardship of Faith*.' J. E. L. Oulton: 'Angus *The Environment of Early Christianity*.'

C. G. Shaw : 'Sparrow Simpson *The Catholic Conception of the Church.*'  
W. N. Harvey : 'W. H. Carnegie *Democracy and Christian Doctrine.*'

*The Irish Theological Quarterly* (Vol. XI. No. 42. April 1916. Dublin : M. H. Gill). J. Kelleher : 'Fr. Slater on Just Price and Value.' E. F. Sutcliffe, S.J. : 'The Divine Carpenter.' J. M. O'Sullivan : 'Some Prejudices of Criticism.' G. Pierse : 'The Human Character of Jesus. A Proof of His Divinity.' J. O'Neill : 'Bishop of Down *God and Freedom in Human Experience.*' G. Pierse : 'Swete *The Holy Catholic Church.*' P. Boylan : 'Lummis *How Luke was written.*' J. MacCaffrey : 'P. Power *Life of St. Declan of Ardmore and Life of St. Mochuda.*'

*The London Quarterly Review* (No. 250. April 1916. C. H. Kelly). H. R. Mackintosh : 'Theology, Life, and the War.' G. W. Thorn : 'Dostoevsky as a Psychologist.' T. A. Seed : 'Shakespeare's Ideal of Heroic Manhood.' H. M. Hughes : 'Can we still be Christians?' T. H. S. Escott : 'Wellington and Blücher.' A. T. Burbridge : 'The Doctrine of the Social Trinity.' E. J. Thompson : (1) 'Samson Agonistes'; (2) 'Rabindranath Tagore and his Work.' C. Kernahan : 'The Last Days of Theodore Watts-Dunton.' D. G. Whitley : 'Sand-buried Cities in Central Asia.' W. S. Caldecott : 'Petrie *Egypt and Israel.*' 'Foakes-Jackson (and others) *The Faith and the War.*' 'Peel *The Seconde Part of a Register.*' 'Saintsbury *The Peace of the Augustans.*' 'R. G. Moulton *The Modern Study of Literature*' (invaluable).

*The Constructive Quarterly* (Vol. IV. No. 1. March 1916. Milford). I. I. Sokoloff : 'The Orthodox Church of Constantinople.' R. E. Speer : 'Some Aspects and Problems of Missions in the Far East.' F. Niebergall : 'Prayer and the Answer to Prayer.' J. T. F. Farquhar : 'The Holy Eucharist.' T. R. Glover : 'Immortality and the Person of Jesus Christ.' R. Seeberg : 'Fundamental Characteristics of N.T. Christology.' C. Besse : 'Intellectualist Theodicy in France.' J. B. Remensnyder : 'The Basic Call for the World Conference on Church Unity.' R. Roberts : 'Catholicity and Nationality.' E. Rochat : 'Christianity, a Unifying Power in War-Time.' B. W. Wells : 'Archbishop Theodore. English Church Reunion in the Seventh Century.'

*The American Journal of Theology* (Vol. XX. No. 2. April 1916. Chicago University Press). G. B. Foster : 'The Contribution of Critical Scholarship to Ministerial Efficiency.' G. E. Wolfe : 'Troeltsch's Conception of the Significance of Jesus.' J. W. Thompson : 'The German Church and the Conversion of the Baltic Slavs.' S. H. Mellone : 'Degrees of Truth.' A. C. Watson : 'The Logic of Religion,' II. F. Eakin : 'Aorists and Perfects in First-Century Papyri.' J. A. Bower : 'Ehrlich *Randglossen zur hebräischen Bibel*' ('monumental'). J. M. P. Smith : 'Van Hoonacker *Une Communauté Judéo-Araméenne à Eléphantine*'; 'Codex Alexandrinus in Reduced Photographic Facsimile, I. *Genesis-Ruth.*' A. T. Olmstead : 'L. W. King *History of Babylon*,' II (8 pp. critical). G. A. Barton : 'Johns *The Laws of Babylonia and the Laws of the Hebrew Peoples*' (critical). A. Ungnad : 'Poebel and Barton *Publications of the Babylonian Section, University of Pennsylvania*, IV i, V, VI i.' J. P. Deane : 'Hayes *Paul and His Epistles.*' M. Sprengling : 'Karst *Eusebius Werke.*' V. *Die Chronik aus dem Armenischen übersetzt.*' S. J. Case : 'W. F. Cobb *Spiritual Healing.*' R. H. Tukey : 'A. B. Cook *Zeus*'; 'Warde Fowler *Roman Ideas of Deity.*' W. E. Clarke : 'Macnicol *Indian Theism*'; 'Stevenson *The Heart of Jainism.*' A. C. Watson : 'McGiffert *The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas.*' 'Lummis *How Luke was written.*'

*The Princeton Theological Review* (Vol. XIV. No. 2. April 1916. Princeton University Press). B. B. Warfield : '"Redeemer" and "Redemption."' C. W. Hodge : 'What is a Miracle?' (62 pp.) H. W. Rankin : 'Philosophy and the Problem of Revelation' (46 pp.) W. B. Greene, jr. : 'Thornton *Conduct and the Supernatural*' (7 pp. favourable); 'Archer-Shepherd *The Nature and Evidence of the Resurrection of Christ*' ('small but remarkable'; critical). B. B. Warfield : 'Shear-

man *The Natural Theology of Evolution* (3½ pp.); 'Schumacher *Christus in seiner Präexistenz u. Kenose*'; 'Rawlinson *Dogma, Fact and Experience*'; 'Fleming *Mysticism in Christianity*'; 'Buckham *Mysticism and Modern Life*,' 'MacGregor *Christian Freedom*' (5 pp.) J. D. Davis: 'Rogers *History of Babylonia and Assyria*,' F. W. Loetscher: 'Lagarde *The Latin Church in the Middle Ages*' (critical); 'McGiffert *The Rise of Modern Religious Ideas*'; 'C. H. Robinson *History of Christian Missions*,' J. P. Hoskins: 'Carus *Goethe with Special Consideration of his Philosophy*,' G. Vos: 'Schlatter *Recht u. Schuld in der Geschichte*.'

*The Jewish Quarterly Review* (N.S. Vol. VI. No. 4. April 1916. Philadelphia: Dropsie College. London: Macmillan). I. Lebendiger: 'The Minor in Jewish Law,' I. I. Efros: 'The Problem of Space in Jewish Mediaeval Philosophy,' I (59 pp.) M. H. Segal: 'Studies in the Books of Samuel,' II. I. Friedlaender: 'Note on "An Autograph Responsum of Maimonides"' (*J.Q.R.* VI, 225 ff.)

*The English Church Review* (Vol. VII. Nos. 76-8. April-June 1916. Longmans). 'Recent Episcopal Charges' (Archbishop of York and Bps. of Birmingham, Southwark and Worcester). W. M. T. Conran, S.S.J.E.: 'The National Mission and "Calling upon the Name of the Lord."' F. Underhill: 'Extra-Liturgical Devotions to the Blessed Sacrament' (criticized by Canon A. A. Markham [May] and 'Senex' and S. A. King [June]). N. Figgis: 'The Mysteries of Love. Bethlehem. The Helplessness of Love.' R. H. Cotton: 'Mystical Substitution.' W. J. Sparrow Simpson: 'The Church Quarterly and The English Church Review.' Archdeacon of Aston: 'The Use of Ceremonial in Religious Worship.' H. U. Whelpton: 'The Sacrament of Penance,' V. May. Archbishop of Melbourne: 'The State of the Departed.' 'Dissatisfaction with the English Communion Office,' I (II. June. A Catena). 'Report on Religious Unity.' M. R. Newbolt: 'The Contribution of the Church of England to Foreign Missions.' N. Figgis: 'K. Lake *The Stewardship of Faith*.' 'Principles of Agreement between Roman and Anglican.' 'Letters of R. M. Benson.' 'Rowden *Primates of the Four Georges*,' June. O. B. G. Johnson: 'The Religious Revival in the Army.' C. M. Bowen: 'Religion in Russian Novels.' W. J. Sparrow Simpson: 'Bossuet's Sermons on the Blessed Virgin Mary.' H. E. Tudor: 'Intercession.' D. Jones: 'The Royal Martyr.' 'Sir E. Clark *The National Church*.' 'Cunningham *Christianity and Politics*.' 'C. E. Osborne *Religion in Europe and the World Crises*.'

*The Churchman* (Vol. XXX. Nos. 124-6. April-June 1916. R. Scott). 'The Spiritual Problems of the Great War. II. The Cross among the Ruins' (by E. A. Burroughs). III. (June) 'The Common Life of Men and Women' (by M. C. Gollock). A. H. T. Clarke: 'The Fulfilment of Prophecy.' E. A. Tindall: 'Bp. of Manchester *The Glad Tidings of Reconciliation*.' A. Plummer: 'The War and the Other World. II. Is there Another World?' (May. III. 'What can we know about the Other World?' June. IV. 'Can those who are in one World influence those who are in the Other?'). S. H. Gem: 'Richard Hooker and the Holy Communion.' 'J. G. Simpson *The Conception of the Church*.' 'Zwemer *Mohammed or Christ?*' 'Collison *In the Wake of the War Canoe*.' May. A. C. Jennings: 'The Decree of the First Church Council.' C. H. K. Boughton: 'Authority and Authorities in the Church of England,' I (II. June). M. W. T. Conran, S.S.J.E.: 'The National Mission and the Need of Instruction in a Method of Prayer.' M. Carus-Wilson: 'What do we expect from the National Mission?' B. Braithwaite: 'Dr. Johnson and his Times,' I (II. June). 'Cunningham *Christianity and Politics*.' K. E. Khodadad: 'Hastings *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, I' (laudatory). June. Bp. of Winchester: 'A War-Time Missionary Sermon' (C.M.S. Anniversary). W. S. Hooton: 'Wilson-Carmichael *Walker of Tinnevely*.' 'J. T. Merz *Religion and Science*.' 'S. C. Kirkpatrick *Through the Jews to God*.'



*The Expositor* (Nos. 64-6. April-June 1916. Hodder and Stoughton). Most Rev. J. H. Bernard (Archbishop of Dublin): 'The Descent into Hades and Christian Baptism (A Study of 1 Peter iii 19 ff)' (June. 'The Gates of Hades'). C. W. Emmet: Romans xv and xvi. A new Theory.' R. H. Strachan: 'The Birth of a New Message. Isaiah xl 1-11.' W. Morison: 'Christ's Confidence in His Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God.' A. Mingana: 'Remarks on the Hebrew of Genesis.' J. E. McFadyen: 'The Mosaic Origin of the Decalogue. The Fourth Commandment' (May. 'The Second Commandment'). May. G. Edmundson: 'The Enigma of Titus.' (The late) Sir A. R. Simpson: 'The Physical Cause of the Death of Christ.' J. M. Thompson: 'The Interpretation of John vi.' F. Granger: 'The Semitic Element in the Fourth Gospel.' F. R. M. Hitchcock: '"Every Creature," not "All Creation," in Romans viii 22.' June. J. Moffatt: 'St. Augustine's Advice to an Army Officer.' H. F. Moule: 'The Greek Testament of Erasmus.' F. H. Colson: 'The Divorce Exception in St. Matthew.' H. A. A. Kennedy: 'The Regulative Value for the Pauline Theology of the Conception of Christian Sonship.' B. H. Tower: 'St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. A Paraphrase.'

*The Expository Times* (Vol. XXVII. Nos. 8-9. May-June 1916: T. and T. Clark). A. M. Adam: 'The Mysticism of Greece' (II. June). H. R. Mackintosh: 'The Revelation of God in Christ.' Sir W. M. Ramsay: 'The Denials of Peter,' II (III. June). J. Warschauer: 'The Mystery of the Kingdom.' G. Jackson: 'Richard Baxter's Autobiography.' A. Henderson: '1 Tim. i 14.' J. N. Farquhar: 'Hindu and Christian Light.' T. H. Weir: 'Matth. xi 19.' L. A. Pooler: 'The Baptism of John (St. Matt. iii 5, 6).' A. Mingana: 'More Sayings attributed to Christ.' R. E. Lee: '1 Cor. xv 5-8.' W. R. W. Gardner: 'Gen. xviii 20, 21.' J. L. Bedford: 'The Wind of God.' J. Hastings: 'E. A. Abbott *The Law of the New Kingdom*.' J. O. F. Murray *Studies in the Temptation of the Son of God*. 'Sorel *Reflections on Violence*.' 'Grisar Luther, V.' 'Journal of John Wesley, VII.' 'Cunningham *Christianity and Politics*.' 'Wilson-Carmichael *Walker of Tinnevely*.' June. J. Abelson: 'The Attitude of Judaism towards War.' A. Wright: 'The Baptist's Advice to the Several Classes, Luke iii 10-14.' A. E. Garvie: 'Prayer in Relation to Human Freedom.' J. O. Adams: 'John Mark.' J. Moffatt: 'Uncanonical Gospel Fragments.' J. Mann: '"Her that kept the Door."' E. Buonaiuti: 'Pelagius and the Pauline Vulgate.' P. Thomson: 'Philotimeomai.' C. M. Draper: 'Colossians iii 3.' J. C. James: 'Mansiones Multae.' T. H. Weir: 'Ps. xxiii 5.' A. Plummer: 'The Submerged City of Is.' J. Hastings: 'Oesterley *Studies in Isaiah xl-lxvi*.' 'Ryle *Life after Death*.' 'Lacey *Conscience of Sin*.' 'Burroughs *The Fight for the Future*.' 'Wheeler *Anthropomorphism and Science*.' 'Goodsell *History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution*.'

*The Catholic World* (Vol. CIII. Nos. 613-5. April-June 1916. New York: 120-122 West 60th Street). A. Morgan: 'Shakespeare—His Third Centennial.' D. A. Lord, S.J.: 'G. B. Shaw,' II. J. J. Walsh: 'Cervantes, Shakespeare and some Historical Backgrounds.' Brother Leo: 'The Master Dramatist. William Shakespeare, 1564-1616.' M. Bateman: 'Martindale *Life of Mgr. R. H. Benson*.' K. Brégy: 'The Shakespeare Tercentenary.' J. U. McKee: 'The Charities Investigation.' 'H. W. C. Davis *Mediaeval Europe*' (favourable). 'De Laguna *Introduction to the Science of Ethics*.' 'Plummer 2 *Corinthians*.' May. T. F. Woodlock: 'The Security of Democracy.' E. T. Shanahan: 'The Traditional Idea of God and its Modern Substitutes.' Brother Leo: 'The Little Flower and Literature.' T. J. Brennan: 'What will happen



Poland?' F. A. Palmieri: 'Catholic Unity and Protestant Disunion' (June. 'The United Ruthenian Church of Galicia under Russian Rule'). J. J. Walsh: 'The Evolution of Man' (June. 'The Cave Man'). A. M. Roussel: 'French Catholic Missionaries and the European War.' J. F. Wickham: 'The Will to achieve.' 'Fröbes *Lehrbuch der experimentellen Psychologie*.' June. H. Somerville: 'The Apostle of Organized Charity (St. Vincent de Paul).' E. T. Shanahan: 'What is Dogma?' H. B. Binns: 'The Birth of the Christian Drama.' T. J. Shahan: 'The Catholic University of America (1889-1916).' C. H. A. Wager: 'The Writings of Montgomery Carmichael.' 'R. Bridges *The Spirit of Man*.'

*The English Historical Review* (Vol. XXXI. No. 122. April 1916. Longmans). W. A. B. Coolidge: 'The History of the Col de Tenda.' W. T. Laprade: 'Public Opinion and the General Election of 1784.' E. D. Bradby: 'Marie Antoinette and the Constitutionals—the Heidenstam Letters.' E. W. Brooks: 'The Emperor Leo V and Vardan the Turk.' C. H. Haskins: 'The Materials for the Reign of Robert I of Normandy.' J. H. Round: 'The Date of the Grand Assize' (=the Assize of Windsor, April 1179). A. G. Little: 'The Authorship of the Lanercost Chronicle.' M. Wilkinson: 'The English on the Gironde in 1592-3.' H. Temperley: 'A Note on Inner and Outer Cabinets; their Development and Relations in the Eighteenth Century.' Sir W. H. St. John Hope: 'Baldwin Brown *The Arts in Early England*, III-IV.' Sir E. Pears: 'Sykes *The Caliph's Last Heritage*.' W. Hunt: 'Lees *Alfred the Great*.' 'Ward *The Sequel to Catholic Emancipation*.' J. N. Figgis: 'Carlyle *Mediaeval Political Theory in the West*, III.' H. H. E. Craster: 'Farrer *Early Yorkshire Charters*, II.' C. Johnson: 'Longnon *Documents relatifs au Comté de Champagne et de Brie*, 1172-1361, III.' W. Miller: 'Gerola *I Monumenti medioevali delle Tredici Sporadi*.' C. L. Kingsford: 'Deansley *The Incendium Amoris of Richard Rolle of Hampole* (critical); 'Evans *Wales and the Wars of the Roses*.' J. H. Clapham: 'A. H. Johnson *History of the Drapers Company* I-II.' J. P. Whitney: 'P. S. Allen *Opus Epistolarum Des. Erasmi*, III.' S. L. Ollard: 'Wickham Legg *Crammer's Liturgical Projects*.' G. C. M. Smith: 'Wallace *Life of Sir Philip Sidney*.' 'Firth *An American Garland*.' H. E. Egerton: 'Foster *The English Factories in India*, 1651-4.' Sir A. W. Ward: 'Marriott and Robertson *The Evolution of Persia*.' Ven. W. H. Hutton: 'Muir *The Making of British India, 1756-1858*.' W. B. Wood: 'Wilkinson *The French Army before Napoleon*.' 'Despréaux *Le Maréchal Mortier*, I-II.' R. L. P[oo]le: 'E. A. Fry *Almanacks for Students of English History*.' A. G. L[ittle]: 'Sever *English Franciscans under Henry III*.' 'G. C. M. Smith *Henry Tubbe*.' J. B. B[ury]: 'The Balkans.' E. W. W[atson]: 'Chetham *Miscellanies*, III.' 'A. Clark *Lincoln Diocesan Documents*.' H. E. S[alter]: 'J. Wilson *Register of the Priory of St. Bees*.'

*The Quarterly Review* (No. 447. April 1916. John Murray). J. A. Smith: 'Philosophy and Theism.' Lord Parker of Waddington: 'Some After-War Problems.' 'Aircraft in the War.' E. P. Stebbing: 'The Forests of Finland and European Timber Supplies.' R. B. Ewbank: 'The Co-operative Movement in India.' R.-G. Lévy: 'German Business Methods in France before the War.' E. Young: 'The Boy Scout Movement.' F. J. C. Hearnshaw: 'Compulsory Military Service in England.' A. V. Dicey: 'Thoughts on the Parliament of Scotland.' Sir Home Gordon, Bart.: 'W. G. Grace.' C. Maugham: 'The Shipping Problem.' Sir A. Geikie, O.M.: 'Horace at his Sabine Farm.' H. Ward: 'The Granville Correspondence.' E. Crammond: 'Retrenchment and Thrift.' Col. W. P. Blood: 'The Course of the War' (with two Maps). 'The Recruiting Crisis.'

*The Nineteenth Century and After* (Nos. 470-72. April-June 1916. Spottiswoode, Ballantyne and Co.) 'The Reorganisation of the Empire. I. An Australian View (by the Hon. B. R. Wise); II. The Coming of the Empire Cabinet (by Sidney Low).' J. H. Morgan: 'With the French Armies.' J. E. Barker: 'How the Army has ruined Germany.' F. J. C. Hearnshaw: 'The Baltic and the Sequel to a Premature Peace.' Right Rev. H. Bury: 'Concerning Prisoners of War.' S. P. B. Mais: 'Our Greatest Privilege and Greatest Achievement.' F. Passelcq: 'Lettre à un Neutre sur les Atrocités allemandes en Belgique. L'Objection d'In vraisemblance.' L. R. Brown: 'Charlotte Brontë and Belgium.' Viscountess Barrington: 'The Cult of Economy.' Sir H. H. Johnston: 'Kilimanjaro.' F. E. Green: 'Home Colonisation by Soldiers and Sailors.' Sir M. Morris: 'A Case for Immediate Action.' C. H. Wright: 'A Russian Byliny.' D. C. Lathbury: 'Clearing Skies.' May. Dr. A. Shadwell: 'The Trials to Come.' J. W. Headlam: 'The Real Aims of the "Peaceful" German Nation.' W. Sichel: 'Germany and Ireland. "England's Achilles-Heel."' Right Rev. J. E. C. Welldon: 'Conscience and the Conscientious Objector.' Sir F. Piggott: 'The Blockade and the Honour of England. A Reply to the *Quarterly Review*' [Jan. 1916]. Sir O. Lodge: 'A Classical Death Phantom' (with a Verse-Translation from Ovid *Metamorphoses* xi 415-748 by M. A. Bayfield). Earl of Cromer: 'Rousseau.' Dr. Mary Scharlieb: 'The Hope of the Future. An Inquiry into the Causes of Infantile Mortality—and some Suggestions.' A. M. W. Stirling: 'Fighting in Flanders in 1793-4. (From the Diary of Charles Hotham, Coldstream Guards).' P. P. Howe: 'Then and Now. A Glance at the Pages of Crabb Robinson.' Very Rev. J. Armitage Robinson: 'The Early Career of John Cumin, Archbishop of Dublin.' F. M. D. Berry: 'An Unwilling Foe. Sidelights on Austria-Hungary.' J. A. R. Marriott: 'War Finance—the Fourth War Budget.' F. Gribble: 'How Germany can pay.' June. Sir C. Lucas: '"The Empire on the Anvil."' E. H. Currey, R.N.: 'Sea Power in its Dual Relation.' 'The Irish Enigma Again. I. What is wrong in Ireland? (by J. R. Fisher). II. An Appeal for an Irish Entente—a Lesson from S. Africa (by J. C. Sheridan). III. The Sinn Féin Rebellion (by R. H. Murray).' J. E. Barker: 'The Future of Asiatic Turkey.' Earl of Cromer: 'Democracy and Diplomacy.' J. Delcourt: 'Shakespeare and the French Mind.' C. Dawbarn: 'Some Causes of Misconception. The Impressions of an English Resident in Paris.' A. C. Benson: 'Education after the War.' D. Ainslie: 'Benedetto Croce and his Activities.' J. H. Longford: 'The Bible of the Japanese Soldier.' A. W. Gattie: 'National Railways after the War. A Reply to Mr. Hyndman.' R. Machray: 'The Resurgence of Russia.' 'Trials to come. I. Preparation for Peace (by A. Paterson). II. Our Soldiers after the War. A Suggestion (by Capt. G. S. C. Swinton).'

*Revue Biblique* (N.S. Vol. XIII. Nos. 1-2. January-April 1916. Paris: Lecoffre-Gabalda). E. Levesque: 'Quelques Procédés littéraires de S. Matthieu.' Mgr. P. Batiffol: (1) 'Une prétendue Anaphore apostolique'; (2) 'Oracula hellenica.' J. P. Frey: 'Dieu et le Monde d'après les Conceptions juives au Temps de Jésus-Christ.' H. Jeannotte: 'Le Texte du Psautier de S. Hilaire de Poitiers.' M. J. Lagrange: (1) 'Le Commentaire de Luther sur l'Épître aux Romains,' II; (2) 'La Vulgate latine de l'Épître aux Romains et le Texte grec.' E. Michon: 'Rebords de Bassins chrétiens ornés de Reliefs, II' (Illustrated). G. Bonaccorsi: 'A Proposito di Semitismi nel N.T.' M. Abel: 'Le Commentaire de S. Jérôme sur Isaïe.' E. Jacquier: 'Le N.T. et les Découvertes modernes.' M. J. Lagrange: 'Loisy *L'Épître aux Galates* (9 pp.); 'Poebel *Babylonian Historical Texts* and Langdon *Sumerian Epic of Paradise*' (9 pp.); 'Woolley and Lawrence *The Wilderness of Zin*.' 'Humbert *Qohéleth*' (4 pp.). 'Vandervorst *Israël et l'Ancien Orient*' (3 pp.). 'Ungnad

*Babylonian Letters of the Hammurapi Period.* 'Gauckler *Nécropoles puniques de Carthage.*'

*Revue des Jeunes* (Vol. XII. Nos. 7-11. April-June 1916. Paris: Lethielleux). L. Rouzic: 'Lecture pour la Semaine Sainte' (No. 8. 'Lecture pour la Fête de Pâques'). G. Dumesnil: 'Nietzsche Luthérien.' A. de Bavier: 'L'Angleterre chevaleresque.' A. D. Sertillanges: 'La Prière intérieure et extérieure' (No. 8. 'Le Rosaire.' No. 9. 'La Prière sacramentelle.' No. 10. 'Les Heures chrétiennes.' No. 11. 'Les Heures canonicales'); V. Giraud: 'Miracle français et Miracle italien.' R. Salomé: 'Le Prêtre catholique et l'Armée nationale.' No. 9. M. Vausard: 'Lettre d'Italie.' 'Comment un Universitaire retrouva Dieu.' P. de Lescure: 'Notre Dette à l'Égard des Morts.' No. 10. T. de Poncheville: 'Une Retraite dans la Tranchée, I' (No. 11. II). J. Hébert: 'La Parole de Jésus.' G. Dumesnil: 'Fausse Profondeur de Goethe.' No. 11. V. Giraud: 'Stoïcisme et Christianisme au XVI<sup>e</sup> Siècle.'

*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* (Vol. VI. No. 2. April-June 1916. Bern: Stämpfli). E. Herzog: 'Kirchlichkeit u. Kirchliche Verständigung.' A. Gilg: 'Nochmals zur Frage nach der Christlichkeit der Mystik.' A. Maschek: 'Zur Frage nach der Christlichkeit der Mystik. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis der Mystik überhaupt.' R. Keussen: 'Mystik u. christliche Frömmigkeit.' L. Barbar: 'Zum Kampf der Bulgaren um ihre nationale Kirche.' J. Friedrich: 'Meine Briefe an Döllinger aus dem Konzilsjahre 1869/1870,' II. A. Rinkel: 'Das Hauptstück "De Sacramentis in Genere,"' II. 'Property, its Duties and Rights.'

*The Theological Study* (Vol. VII. Nos. 3-4. February-April 1916. Tokyo: Keiseisha Shoten, 15 Owaricho Ni-chome, Kyobashi). D. Ebina: 'A Study of the Meaning of the Trinity.' J. H. Kobayashi: 'A Philosophy—Not a Myth.' S. Kojima: 'An Epistemological Inquiry of Faith.' J. Mizuno: 'The Aborigines of Formosa and their Religious Ideas.' K. Itoh: 'Prof. Cornill on Moses the Founder of Monotheism.' T. Ikezono: 'Prof. Davis on Congregationalism.' R. Ohta: (1) 'Dr. Folks on the Church of Rome'; (2) 'The Present Condition of the Study of the O.T.,' I (II, April). T. Sugai: 'R. H. Charles *Religious Development between O. and N.T.*' April. J. S. Sugiura: 'A Study of the Miracles in the Gospel.' K. Nonomura: 'The Modern Historical Studies of Christianity.' S. Kojima: 'The Philosophy of Lao-Tze. His Method.' J. H. Kobayashi: 'Pringle-Pattison on Balfour's Theism and Humanism.' M. Takano: 'Mohammed and his Qur'an.' 'Mozley *Doctrine of the Atonement.*' 'King *History of Babylon.*' 'Rogers *History of Babylonia and Assyria.*' 'Strickland *Foundations of Christian Belief.*' 'Ladd *What should I believe?*' 'Driscoll *Pragmatism and the Problem of the Idea.*' 'Croce *The Philosophy of Hegel.*'

*Theologisch Tijdschrift* (N.S. Vol. VIII. Nos. 2-3. 1916. Leiden: S. C. van Doesburgh). M. Wolff: 'Is het Boek Esther Historie of Fictie?' (45 pp.). K. Vos: 'Jets over Gods Almacht.' F. M. T. Böhl: 'Ausgewählte Keilschrifttexte aus Boghaz-Köi.' D. H. Windisch: 'Christuskult u. Paulinismus.' B. D. Eerdmans: 'Grondwetsherziening en Openbaar Onderwijs.' 'Oldenberg *Die Lehre der Upanishaden u. die Anfänge des Buddhismus.*'

*Teologisk Tidsskrift* (N.S. Vol. VII. No. 2. 1916. Copenhagen: G. E. C. Gad). C. Glarbo: 'Religionshistorie og Teologi,' II. M. Gjessing: 'Kirkeligt Liv i Norge i 1915.' H. Mosbech: 'Messel *Die Einheitlichkeit der jüdischen Eschatologie*.' 'Torm Paulus' *Breve til Timotheus og Titus.*' F. Torm: 'Thieme *Das apostolische Glaubensbekenntnis*.' 'Schlatte *Recht u. Schuld in der Geschichte.*' C. Glarbo: 'Krarup *Livsforsaaelse.*'

*The Hindustan Review* (Vol. XXXIII. No. 200. April 1916. Allahabad: 7 Elgin Road). F. H. Davis: 'The Emperors of Japan.' B. K.

Sarkar : 'China and India under the first Emperors,' I. K. T. Shah : 'British Budget in War.' K. L. Oza : 'Agricultural Colonies for Discharged Soldiers.' B. G. Steinhoff : 'The Pleasures of Life.' B. S. Rao : 'History of Education in the United Provinces,' II. S. B. Doraiswami : 'The Indian Budget for 1916-17 and the Imperial Financial System.' A. R. Wadia : 'Pragmatism or the Philosophy of the Practical.' 'A. Besant *India a Nation*' (laudatory).

*International Review of Missions* (Vol. V. No. 18. April 1916. Milford). 'A Missionary Survey of the Year 1915. The Home Base.' R. E. Speer : 'The General Environment of Missions in China at the Present Time.' N. Macnicol : 'Hindu Devotional Mysticism.' K. Fries : 'Swedish Missions.' G. A. Gollock : 'A Woman of France [La Sœur Saint-Charles, missionnaire au Gabon] and a Woman of Scotland [Mary Slessor of Calabar].' W. D. Mackenzie : 'The Progress of Missionary Preparation in N. America.' S. Eddy : 'The Present Situation in India.' R. F. Moorshead : 'The Church in the Mission Field and Medical Missions.' J. H. Harris : 'Two Missing Links' [in the Preparation of Missionaries and in the Training in Mission Schools]. P. J. MacLagan : 'Giles *Confucianism and its Rivals*.' E. Sell : 'Zwemer *Mohammed or Christ*.' W. S. Urquhart : 'R. W. Frazer *Indian Thought*.' 'Nivedita *Footfalls of Indian History and Religion and Dharma*.' R. Hoernle : 'Stevenson *The Heart of Jainism*.' A. H. L. Fraser : 'Matthai *Village Government in British India*.' R. Maconachie : 'Ogilvie *The Apostles of India*.' W. D. Weatherford : 'Evans *Black and White in the Southern States*.' J. O. F. Murray : 'Keable *A City of the Dawn*.'

*The Church Missionary Review* (Vol. LXVII. Nos. 804-6. April-June 1916. C.M.S.) W. S. Hunt : '"To benefit the Syrian Church." Origin and Inception of the Syrian Travancore Mission' (May. 'Travancore and Cochin. A Centenary Survey'). Major A. Neve, R.A.M.C. : 'India's Response and the Reason why.' J. B. McCullagh : 'A Fragment of Primitive Speech. A Study of the Roots of the Language of the Nisger Indians of British Columbia.' Bishop of Madras : 'India and the War.' S. R. Skeens : 'A Missionary Conference Address in Busoga.' 'Missionaries in Submarine Attacks.' 'Ogilvie *The Apostles of India*.' May. S. J. Edwin and R. T. Howard : 'Problem of the Mass Movement in the C.M.S. Districts of the United Provinces.' Right Rev. H. R. Hulse : 'The Panama Congress.' H. Barton : 'The Chekiang Diocesan Synod.' 'Farquhar *Modern Religious Movements in India*.' June. Bishop of Winchester : 'The War and a Larger Horizon' (Anniversary Sermon). G. F. Smith : '"Carry on"—with Thankfulness and Courage. The 117th Anniversary of the C.M.S.' E. Stock : 'Bishop Peel of Mombasa.' E. S. Woods : 'The Need of Spiritual Leadership.' E. H. Pearce : 'The Mount of Transfiguration.' F. S. Webster : 'Revival or Chaos—which?' 'Livingstone *Mary Slessor of Calabar*.' 'Beatty *Human Leopards*.'

*The East and the West* (Vol. XIV. No. 54. April 1916. S.P.G.) Bishop of Sierra Leone : 'West Africa and the War.' Ven. C. W. Farquhar : 'New Methods and Old Problems in W. Africa.' J. L. Barton : 'American Missions in Turkey.' D. Macfadyen : 'Missionary Education in America.' B. Ullah : 'Conflict of Religions in the Punjab.' W. C. B. Purser : 'A Christian Hermit in Burma.' H. Kelly, S.S.M. : 'The Pattern of a Missionary Church.' P. B. Emmet : '"Our Attitude towards Hinduism"—a Reply.' 'The World Conference on Faith and Order.' C. H. Robinson : 'Boniface, the "Apostle of Germany."' 'Bp. Brent *The Inspiration of Responsibility*.' 'Purchas *History of the English Church in New Zealand*.' 'Carmichael *Walker of Tinnevely*.' 'Sibree *A Naturalist in Madagascar*.' 'Roscoe *The Northern Bantu*.' 'Bp. Montgomery *Life's Journey*.' 'Thorburn *The Historical Jesus*.' 'Hines *The Red Indians of the Plains*.' 'Collison *In the Wake of the War Canoe*.'



## BOOKS RECEIVED.

The more important will be noticed in Articles and Short Notices as space permits.

## BIBLICAL STUDIES.

DODSON, T. H.—*The Book of Jonah : a Study of Biblical Purpose and Method*. Pp. 84. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. net. By the Rector of Wootton, Northampton.

HALL, A. C. A. (BISHOP OF VERMONT).—*The Psalter, its Growth, Character and Use*. Pp. viii + 44. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

ROPES, J. H.—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle of St. James*. 'International Critical Commentary.' Pp. xvi + 320. (T. and T. Clark.) 9s. net. By the Hollis Professor of Divinity in Harvard University.

SOUTER, A.—*The Character and History of Pelagius' Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul*. Pp. ii + 36. (Milford.) 2s. 6d. net. From the *Proceedings of the British Academy*, Vol. vii.

TWEEDIE, A.—*A Sketch of Amos and Hosea, their Message and their Times*. Pp. vi + 116. (Blackwood.) 2s. 6d. net. By the Minister of Strachan Parish Church.

WATSON, H. A.—*The Mysticism of St. John's Gospel*. Being the Hulsean Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge, 1915-1916. Revised and enlarged. Pp. 186. (R. Scott.) 3s. 6d. net. By the Rector of Knapton, Norfolk.

*A Companion to Biblical Studies*. Being a Revised and Re-written edition of *The Cambridge Companion to the Bible*. Edited by W. EMERY BARNES. Pp. xii + 678. (Cambridge University Press.) 15s. net. With 10 maps and 8 Illustrations. See Short Notice.

*The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel*. In the Revised Version with Notes and Introduction by the late A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D. Revised by the late A. W. STREANE, D.D. 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges.' Pp. lxii + 404. (Cambridge University Press.) 3s. 6d. net.

*The Gospel according to St. Mark*. 'Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures.' *The New Testament*, Vol. I. Part II. By J. DEAN. Pp. xviii + 84. (Longmans.) 1s. net. By the Professor of Sacred Scripture, St. Joseph's Diocesan College, Upholland.

## ANTHROPOLOGY AND COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

DENNETT, R. E.—*My Yoruba Alphabet*. Pp. xii + 48. (Macmillan.) 1s. 6d. net.

JAINI, J.—*Outlines of Jainism*. Edited (with Preliminary Note) by F. W. THOMAS. Pp. xl + 156. (Cambridge University Press.) 4s. net.

SAEKI, P. Y.—*The Nestorian Monument in China*. With Introductory Note by LORD WILLIAM GASCOYNE-CECIL and Preface by A. H. SAYCE. Pp. xii + 342. (S.P.C.K.) 10s. 6d. net. By a Professor at the Waseda University, Tokyo.

WEBB, C. C. J.—*Group Theories of Religion and the Individual*. Pp. 208. (G. Allen and Unwin.) 5s. net.

*Islam and Womanhood*. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

## PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION AND APOLOGETICS.

BLAGDEN, C. M.—*Is Prayer of any Value?* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 11. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

BROOKSHIRE, E. V.—*The Law of Human Life: the Scriptures in the Light of the Science of Psychology.* Pp. xlv + 472. (G. P. Putnam's Sons.) 2 dollars 50 net.

CARPENTER, Right Rev. W. BOYD.—*The Witness of Religious Experience.* 'The Donnellan Lectures delivered before the University of Dublin, 1914 and in Westminster Abbey, Lent, 1916.' Pp. viii + 112. (Williams and Norgate.)

COLDWELL, G. E. J.—*The Catholic Platform.* Seven Lectures delivered in Finsbury Park, London, N. Pp. 196. (London: 11A Red Lion Passage, W.C.) 7d. net. Roman Catholic propaganda literature in a popular form.

GREGORY, R. A.—*Discovery Or the Spirit and Service of Science.* Pp. xii + 340. (Macmillan.) 5s. net.

HART J. S.—*Spiritual Sacrifice.* 'Moorhouse Lectures,' 1915. Pp. viii + 244. (Longmans.) 4s. 6d. net. By the Warden of St. John's Theological College, Melbourne.

HART, S.—*The Witness of the Church.* 'Paddock Lectures,' 1915-16. Pp. x + 188. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net. By the Dean of Berkeley Divinity School.

LACEY, T. A.—*Nature and God, discussed in Letters to a Questioner.* Pp. 78. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. net.

LACEY, T. A.—*Nature, Miracle and Sin: a Study of St. Augustine's Conception of the Natural Order.* 'Pringle Stuart Lectures,' 1914. Pp. xiv + 166. (Longmans.) 6s. net.

OXFORD, BISHOP OF.—*Has Christianity failed?* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 1. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

RASHDALL, H.—*Conscience and Christ: Six Lectures on Christian Ethics.* Pp. xx + 314. (Duckworth.) 5s. net.

STEPNEY, BISHOP OF.—*Does God care?* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 6. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

TEMPLE, W.—*Plato and Christianity.* Three Lectures. Pp. viii + 102. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

WAKEFIELD, RIGHT REV. H. R. (Bishop of Birmingham).—*Simple Answers to some Great Questions.* Pp. 80. (Longmans.) 1s. net.

WEBSTER, H.—*Rest Days: a Study in Early Law and Morality.* Pp. xvi + 326. (Macmillan Co.) 12s. 6d. net. By the Professor of Social Anthropology, University of Nebraska.

WILSON, J. M.—*The Natural and the Supernatural in Science and Religion.* Two Lectures to Men delivered in the College Hall, Worcester, in December 1915. Pp. 46. (S.P.C.K.) 6d. net.

## PRACTICAL AND DEVOTIONAL THEOLOGY.

BARDSLEY, G. C. B.—*Preparation in the Congregation for the National Mission of Repentance and Hope.* 'National Mission Paper,' No. 5. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.)  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. net. 4s. per 100 net.

BARDSLEY, C. C. B.—*Revival: the Need and the Possibilities.* With Foreword by the BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL. Pp. 140. (Longmans.) 1s. 6d. net.

BELL, C. C.—*Are we worth dying for?* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 3. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

BURKITT, F. C.—*Some Thoughts on the Athanasian Creed.* Pp. 12. (S.P.C.K.) 2d. net.

BURN, A. E.—*On Forgiving our Enemies.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 15. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

CANTERBURY, ARCHBISHOP OF.—*The National Mission of Repentance and Hope, its Origin and Purpose.* 'National Mission Paper,' No. 1. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.)  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. net. 4s. per 100 net.

CAREY, W. J.—*Have You Understood Christianity?* Pp. 112. (Longmans.) 2s. net.

CAREY, W. J.—*How to Read the Bible Intelligently.* Pp. 24. (Mowbray.) 2d. net.

CASTIN, F. TOMAS DE VILLA (S.J.).—*Instructions and Meditations on the Most Holy Sacrament.* Pp. iv + 52. (The Faith Press: 22 Buckingham St., W.C.) 7d.

CONRAN, M. W. T. (S.S.J.E.).—*The National Mission: how it may be conducted on a Basis of 'Calling upon the Name of the Lord'* (1 Cor. i 2). With Notes on Fifteen Addresses on the Mysteries of Our Lord's Life, together with Instructions for Use in the Mission. Pp. 80. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 6d. net.

CRAFER, T. W.—*A Prophet's Visions and the War: a Message of Repentance and Hope based on Zechariah i-viii and linked with the National Mission.* Pp. xii + 84. (Skeffington.) 2s. net. By the Vicar of All Saints', Cambridge.

DAVID, A. A.—*Twelve Short Meditations for Intercession Services.* Pp. 32. (S.P.C.K.) 6d. net. By the Headmaster of Rugby.

ELLIOTT, S. H.—*The Danger from Within.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 5. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

GARBETT, C. F.—*The Christian and the Sword.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 2. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

GELL, HON. E.—*The War and the Objects of the Mothers' Union.* A course of Model Addresses. I. *The War and the Maintenance of Holy Marriage.* II. *The War and Discipline in the Home.* III. *The War and the Power of Prayer.* IV. *The Call of our Country to Women.* Pp. 64. (Wells Gardner.) 4d. net.

GREEN, P.—*A Soldier's Courage.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 17. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

GREEN, P.—*Wasted Lives?* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 4. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

GWYNNE, RIGHT REV. LL. (OF KHARTOUM).—*Finding God in the trenches.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 16. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

HOLLAND, H. S.—*The Call to Repentance: ad Clerum.* 'National Mission Paper,' No. 3. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.)  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. net. 4s. per 100 net.

HYDE, W. D.—*The Gospel of Good Will as revealed in Contemporary Scriptures.* Pp. xxiv + 246. (Macmillan Co.) 6s. 6d. net. By the President of Bowdoin College.

MANSBRIDGE, A.—*Education and Worship.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 18. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

MARSHALL, G. K. S.—*Carrying on though Wounded.* With Foreword by the Hon. M. B. PEEL. Pp. 14. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net. By the Rector of St. Nicholas Cole Abbey, E.C.

MASTERMAN, J. H. B.—*The Church and the People.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 12. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

MASTERMAN, J. H. B.—*The Life beyond Death.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 7. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

MOORE EDE, W. (DEAN OF WORCESTER).—*The Church after the War.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 9. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

MURRAY, J. O. F.—*The Mission in its National Aspect.* 'National Mission Paper,' No. 4. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.)  $\frac{1}{2}$ d. net; 4s. per 100 net.

POLLOCK, B. (BISHOP OF NORWICH).—*The Brotherhood of Man.* Pp. 64. (S.P.C.K.) 1s. 3d. net.

PUMFREY, W.—*His Servants shall serve Him: a Few Thoughts for Mourners.* Pp. x + 38. (R. Scott.) 1s. net.

ROBERTSON, J. D.—*Reform and Religion in Public Schools.* Pp. viii + 48. (R. Scott.) 1s. net. By the late Science Master of King's School, Taunton.

ROBINSON, A. W.—*The National Mission and the Preparation for it. An Explanation and an Appeal.* 'National Mission Paper,' No. 2. Pp. 12. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net. 5s. per 100 net.

TUPPER-CAREY, A. D.—*The War and its Lessons to the Religious World.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 10. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

W., A. H.—*If Ye Fulfil the Royal Law.* Pp. xlii + 290. (Elliot Stock.) 6s. net.

WALLER-BRIDGE, H. F.—*'With what Body do they come?'* With Foreword by W. E. ROSEDALE. Pp. 40. (Kegan Paul.) 1s. 6d. net.

WOOLLCOMBE, H. S.—*Christian Brotherhood.* 'War-time Tracts for the Workers,' No. 14. Pp. 4. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. per 100 net.

*Revelation and the Life to Come.* Edited with an Introduction in Two Parts by the Author of *The Way: the Nature and Means of Revelation.* Pp. vi + 216. (G. P. Putnam's Sons.) 6s. net.

*The Gospel Drama: its Symbolism and Interpretation.* By JOHN MYSTICUS. Pp. x + 162. (C. W. Daniel, Ltd.) 5s.

#### PASTORAL THEOLOGY.

BELTON, F. G.—*A Manual for Confessors: being a guide to the Administration of the Sacrament of Penance for the Use of Priests of the English Church.* Pp. xviii + 324. (Knott.) 5s. net. By the Vicar of St. Patrick's, Highgate, Birmingham.

BICKERSTETH, H. V.—*Confirmation.* With Foreword by the BISHOP OF CREDITON. Pp. x + 84. (Longmans.) 2s. net. By the Rector of Stanmer with Filmer.

#### SERMONS AND ADDRESSES.

JACOB, E. (BISHOP OF ST. ALBANS).—*Five Addresses to the Clergy of the Diocese of St. Albans.* In Preparation for the National Mission of Repentance and Hope on March 7, 10, 13, 20, 24, 1916. Pp. 72. (S.P.C.K.) 6d. net.

MILLER, J.—*The Church Year of Grace from Modern Continental Divines: Sermons for the Successive Seasons of the Church Year.* Vol. II. *Septuagesima, Sexagesima, Quinquagesima, Passion Time or Lent, Easter.* Pp. vi + 300. (Elliot Stock.) 3s. 6d. net.

SINKER, J.—*The War, its Deeds and Lessons.* Addresses delivered in Lytham Parish Church. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF MANCHESTER. Pp. xii + 130. (Skeffington.) 2s. 6d. net.

#### MISSIONARY PROBLEMS.

LEBOMBO, BISHOP OF.—*The Supply of Clergy.* 'Missionary Tracts for the Times,' No. 7. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net.

MURRAY, J. O. F.—*A Missionary-Hearted Church.* 'Missionary Tracts for the Times,' No. 8. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net.

OLDHAM, J. H.—*The World and the Gospel.* Pp. xvi + 224. (C.M.S.) 2s. net.

TATLOW, T.—*The Church the Organ of Redemption.* 'Missionary Tracts for the Times,' No. 5. Pp. 16. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net.

WHITE, G. (BISHOP OF WILLOCHRA).—*Australian Missions and the War.* 'Missionary Tracts for the Times,' No. 6. (S.P.C.K.) 1d. net.



## LITURGICA AND HYMNOLOGY.

FOTHERINGHAM, D. R.—*The Festivals of Our Lady in East and West*. Pp. ii + 32. (The Faith Press.) 7d. By the Vicar of Charing.

MCDUGALL, A. G.—*Pange Lingua: Breviary Hymns of old Uses with an English Rendering*. Introduction by A. FORTESCUE. Pp. xl + 84. (Burns and Oates.) 5s. net.

*A Form of Prayer for Victory in the War*. Pp. 12. (Exeter: Pollard.) 1d. net. 6s. per 100. Sanctioned for use in the Diocese of Exeter.

*Children's War Service*. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 4s. per 100 net.

*The Children's Prayers in the Great War*. Pp. 8. (S.P.C.K.) 2s. 6d. per 100 net. Compiled and sanctioned for Use in the Diocese of London.

## HISTORY AND ANTIQUITIES.

BOGGIS, R. J. E.—*A History of the Parish and Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Barnstaple*. Pp. viii + 204. (Canterbury: Cross and Jackman.)

BREMOND, H.—*Histoire Littéraire du Sentiment Religieux en France depuis la Fin des Guerres de Religion jusqu'à nos jours*. I. 'L'Humanisme Dévot (1580-1660).' II. 'L'Invasion Mystique (1590-1620).' Pp. xxiv + 552, vi + 616. (Paris: Bloud et Gay.) 8 frs. each. Second edition.

CADMAN, S. P.—*The Three Religious Leaders of Oxford and their Movements: John Wycliffe: John Wesley: John Henry Newman*. Pp. xviii + 596. (Macmillan Co.) 10s. 6d. net.

JACKSON, C. E.—*The Place-Names of Durham*. Pp. 116. (G. Allen and Unwin.) 5s. net. By the Rector of Longnewton, Durham.

JACKSON, SIR T. G.—*Gothic Architecture in France, England, and Italy*. Two Volumes. Pp. xxii + 292, vi + 340. (Cambridge University Press.) 2l. 12s. 6d. net.

ROBINSON, N. F. (S.S.J.E.)—*Monasticism in the Orthodox Churches: being an Introduction to the Study of Modern Hellenic and Slavonic Monachism and the Orthodox Profession Rites, together with a Greek Dissertation on the Monastic Habit, done into English, with Notes*. Pp. xii + 176 (Cope and Fenwick.) 2s. 6d. net. Twelve Illustrations.

SHIRLEY, A.—*St. Cyprian, Bishop and Martyr*. 'Great African Churchmen' series. With Introduction by the BISHOP OF ACCRA. Pp. 48. (Lay Reader Headquarters, 7 Dean's Yard, S.W.) 6d. By the Head of Corpus Christi College Mission, Camberwell. Illustrated.

*Our Place in Christendom*. Lectures delivered at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, in the Autumn of 1915. With Preface by the BISHOP OF LONDON. Pp. viii + 218. (Longmans.) 3s. 6d. net. By Drs. A. J. Mason, Frere, Whitney, Figgis, H. S. Holland and A. W. Robinson and the Bishop of Oxford. See Short Notice.

## WAR LITERATURE AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY.

BAUMANN, A. A.—*Persons and Politics of the Transition*. Pp. xiv + 282. (Macmillan.) 6s. net.

HARRADEN, B.—*Our Warrior Women*. Pp. 16. (London: Witherby and Co., 326 High Holborn.) 2d.

HOLLAND, H. S.—*So as by Fire, Notes on the War*. Second Series. Pp. viii + 118. (Wells-Gardner.) 1s. net and 2s. net.

JONES, D. (C.F.)—*The Diary of a Padre at Suwla Bay*. Pp. 112. (The Faith Press: 22 Buckingham Street, London, W.C.) With 20 Illustrations from Photos by the Author, the Precentor of Manchester Cathedral.

LIVINGSTON, ST. C. and STEEN-HANSEN, I.—*Under Three Flags : With the Red Cross in Belgium, France and Serbia.* Pp. xiv + 238. (Macmillan.) 3s. 6d. net.

MARTIN, H.—*The Girl He Left Behind Him (the Story of a War-Worker)* and '*Vox Clamantis*' (*The Song of a Munition Worker*). By JOHN OXENHAM. Pp. 16. (London : Witherby and Co., 326 High Holborn.) 2d.

MURRAY, G.—*The Foreign Policy of Sir Edward Grey, 1906-1915.* Pp. ii + 128. (Clarendon Press.) 1s. 6d. net.

VELIMIROVIC, N.—*The Religious Spirit of the Slavs.* Three Lectures given in Lent 1916. I. *Slav Orthodoxy.* II. *Slav Revolutionary Catholicism.* III. *The Religious Spirit of the Slavs.* 'Sermons on Subjects suggested by the War,' Third Series. St. Margaret's, Westminster. Pp. iv + 40. (Macmillan.) 1s. net.

VELIMIROVIC, N.—*The Soul of Serbia.* Lectures delivered before the Universities of Cambridge and Birmingham and in London and elsewhere in England. Second edition. Pp. 96. (Faith Press, 22 Buckingham Street, W.C.) 1s. net.

WALDSTEIN, SIR C.—*Aristodemocracy from the Great War back to Moses, Christ and Plato.* Pp. xviii + 434. (Murray.) 10s. 6d. net.

*An Introduction to the Study of International Relations.* By A. J. GRANT, A. GREENWOOD, J. D. I. HUGHES, P. H. KERR and F. F. URQUHART. Pp. viii + 208. (Macmillan.) 2s. net.

*The Problem of the Commonwealth.* Pp. xii + 248. (Macmillan.) 1s. 6d. net.]

#### POETRY.

COMPTON-RICKETT, L. A.—*The Divine Drama, and Poems.* Pp. 276. (Kegan Paul.) 3s. 6d. net.

RICKARDS, M. S. C.—*Echoes from the Prophets.* Pp. xvi + 136. (Clifton : J. Baker and Son.) 2s. 6d. Poems.

TIPLADY, T. (C.F.)—'*In the Trenches*' and other Poems. Pp. 100. (Hemel Hempstead : W. H. Booker.) 1s. net.

#### BIOGRAPHY AND GENERAL LITERATURE.

CROMER, EARL OF.—*Political and Literary Essays.* Third Series. Pp. viii + 334. (Macmillan.) 10s. 6d. net.

HARPER, G. M.—*William Wordsworth, his Life, Works and Influence.* Two volumes. Pp. xvi + 442, viii + 452. (Murray.) 24s. net. See Article III.

MARTINDALE, C. C. (S.J.)—*The Life of Monsignor Robert Hugh Benson.* Two Volumes. Pp. xvi + 402, viii + 480. (Longmans.) 18s. net. With Illustrations.

ROBERTS, W. RHYS.—*Patriotic Poetry, Greek and English : an Address given on the 500th Anniversary of Agincourt.* With Supplementary Notes and References and Four Illustrations. Pp. viii + 144. (Murray.) 3s. 6d. net. By the Professor of Classics, Leeds University.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

GILLMAN, F. J.—*The Workers and Education : a Record of some Present-day Experiments.* With Contributions by A. S. ROWNTREE, M.P., and W. C. BRAITHWAITE. Pp. 68. (G. Allen and Unwin.) 1s. net.

*Zionism and the Future.* By Various Writers. Edited by H. SACKER. Pp. viii + 252. (Murray.) 2s. 6d. net. With 2 Maps.



## INDEX TO VOL. LXXXII.

ABBOTT, EDWIN A., *The Fourfold Gospel*. Section IV. *The Law of the New Kingdom*, 404

BARNES, W. EMERY, *A Companion to Biblical Studies*, 401

BEVAN, W. L., *Church History, Mediaeval and Modern*, 197

BLUNT, WILFRID SCAWEN, *Poetical Works*, 172

BROWNE, Rt. Rev. G. F., *Recollections of a Bishop*, 207

BURY, Rt. Rev. HERBERT, *Russian Life To-day*, 192

*Charge delivered by Mark . . . Bishop in Corea*, 407

CHURCH AND STATE IN INDIA [by the Bishop of Madras], 223 *sqq.*: anomalous position of the Anglican Church in India, 223; exemplified in the different methods of appointing and paying the Bishops, 223-4; episcopal relations with Missionary Societies, 224; the Church's legal position, 224-5; brief historical sketch, 225 *sqq.*: appointment of Chaplains by the Directors of the E.I.C., 226; the Company's hostility to the Roman Church, 226-7; progress during the Eighteenth century, 227; early Nineteenth century controversies in the House of Commons, 228-9; new epoch inaugurated in 1813

with the renewal of the Company's charter, 230; India made a diocese under Letters Patent, 230; beneficial results of the anomalous position, 230-1; tendency of present-day movements, 231; adaptation of the Anglican system to the needs and circumstances of the Indian Church, 232; the desire for a national Church among educated Indian Christians, 233-4; the paramount need of maintaining racial unity within the Church, 234; the position of Europeans and of Eurasians, 235; the financial question, 236-8; the movement against State grants to mission schools and colleges, 238-40; its relation with Government support of Hindu and Mahommedan institutions, 240-1; a purely secular Government repugnant to native wishes, 242; caste difficulties, 243; the best methods for meeting present-day needs, 243-4

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA [by P. V. M. Benecke], 301 *sqq.*: recent editions of Clement's works, 302 *sqq.*; Dr. Stählin's edition, 303; Dr. Patrick's Croall Lecture, 304-5; Mr. Tollinton's study, 305-6; Mr. Rufus Jones' *Selections*, 307; chronology of Clement's life and writings, 308-18; the

*Protrepticus*, 309-11; the *Paedagogus*, 311; the *Stromateis*, 312-5; the *Quis dives salvetur*, 315-6; the *Hypotyposes*, 316-7; Clement's importance in the history of Christian tradition, 318-29; his position as a witness to the Canon of Scripture, 319; negative results yielded by study of his O.T. allusions, 320; uncertainties of his N.T. references, 321 *sqq.*; his view of inspiration, 322; caution needful in estimating the bearing of Clement's evidence as to the limits of the Canon, 323; Mr. Tollinton on Clement's 'Conception of a Canon of the N.T.', 324-5; elements of doubt in Clement's authority on the text, 326-7; estimate of his support for the Western text, 328; his position in regard to non-Christian tradition, 329-36: Clement the meeting-point between Hellenic and Christian tradition, 330; recent increase in the study of Christian beginnings from the classical standpoint, 330-1; sources of Clement's information, 331-4; his position as a philosopher, 334-6; the study of Clement justified by his permanent value, 337; consensus in assigning special prominence to his writings, 338; his general attitude towards philosophy, 339; his sympathies, while fundamentally Christian, inclusive rather than exclusive, 340; lessons to be learnt from the Alexandrian methods of facing intellectual difficulties, 341; Clement's relation to the institutional element in religion, 341-3; his caution in dogmatic statement, 343; his declaration that apprehension

of God by philosophical analysis yields only negative results, 343-4; his insistence on the education of the world through the Logos, 344-5; failure of attempts to stigmatize his language as unorthodox, 345-6; his reluctance to pursue intellectual questions to their logical conclusion, 346-7; comparison between Clement and Origen, 347; the charge made against Clement of 'Christian Agnosticism,' 348

CONGREVE, G., and W. H.

LONGRIDGE, *Letters of Richard Meux Benson*, 415

Corea, *Charge delivered by Mark . . . Bishop in*, 407

CRISIS OF THE WAR, THE, 380 *sqq.*: the present situation viewed from the German standpoint, 380-3; what a victorious Germany's peace terms would mean, 383-4; German designs upon Great Britain, 384-7; Maximilian Harden's views, 388-9; summary of the present state of the war, 390; our three requisites for readiness: (1) men, 390-1; (2) munitions: M. Albert Thomas on French efforts, 391-2; the Labour question in Great Britain, 392-3; (3) capable leadership, 393-4; the Battle of Jutland, 394; Lord Kitchener, 394-5

EMPTY TOMB (THE), THE RESURRECTION BODY AND THE INTERMEDIATE STATE [by the Rev. Dr. J. O. F. Murray], 78 *sqq.*: object of the article, 78; Mr. Kirsopp Lake's position, 79; difficulties felt in accepting his conclusions, 80-1; the writer's standpoint defined, 81-2; the fundamental problem of the Empty Tomb, 83; St. Paul's doctrine